THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VII.—(XXVII).—SEPTEMBER, 1902.—NO. 3.

"CATHOLIC" AND "ROMAN CATHOLIC."

ON the 10th of December, 1869, the Fathers of the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican met together in their first General Council.[1] By the Apostolic Letter *Multiplices inter*, the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX, had prescribed the rules of procedure to be followed in the deliberations of the Council. According to the directions of this Pontifical document, the general assemblies in which all the Fathers met were of two kinds: General Congregations, presided over by five Cardinal-Presidents, and Solemn Public Sessions, under the presidency of the Holy Father himself. In the General Congregations, the Fathers were called upon to decide by vote whether, or in what form, or with what alterations and emendations, the various *schemata* proposed to them should come up for final and definite judgment in the Solemn Public Sessions. In the latter this final judgment was to be passed, after which nothing further was needed to give the decrees thus passed the full force of Conciliar Constitutions than confirmation by the Apostolic authority of the Holy See. The *schemata* presented to the Fathers in General Congregation set forth those matters of which, by the will of the Supreme Pontiff, the Council was to treat, and proposed to them certain statements of Catholic doctrine, canons, and disciplinary decrees, considered to be specially necessary or useful in view of prevalent errors and doubts. Previous to the assembly of the Council, these *schemata* had been drawn up, with extensive annotations,

[1] For a detailed account of the procedure of the Council, see Granderath, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae SS. Conc. Vat.*, Prolog. 1.

by a commission of theologians and canonists specially selected by the Holy Father; and by the provisions of the letter *Multiplices inter*, each *schema* was to be delivered in print to all the Fathers some days before that sitting of the General Congregation in which it was to be discussed.

The object of this early distribution was, of course, to give the Fathers opportunity for consideration and private discussion, so that they might come to the sittings with their minds prepared, and with some knowledge of the probable course of the debates. Those who desired to speak were to give notice to the Cardinal-Presidents at latest on the day before the sitting, and to be ready with any proposals or amendments they wished to bring forward. At the same time, if any Father made up his mind during the debates to make any observations, he could do so with leave of the Presidents. When the proposals and emendations brought forward were numerous, or raised difficulties which could not be adjusted in one sitting of the General Congregation, they were referred, according to their subject-matter, to one of four deputations or committees appointed to revise the *schemata* in accordance with the wishes of the Fathers as made known in debate, and to present them anew in their amended form at a future sitting. This process of amendment and repeated presentations was to be continued until the vote of the majority was obtained in favor of the final subjection of the *schema* to solemn suffrage in public session for Conciliar ratification. While the order of discussion and voting was thus prescribed, the Holy Father expressed his will that the Fathers should not hesitate to bring forward freely any proposals of their own that they should conceive to be of public utility.

The first *schema* submitted to the Council was entitled "Schema constitutionis dogmaticae de doctrina Catholica contra multiplices errores ex rationalismo derivatos." Printed copies of this *schema* were distributed in the first General Congregation, and the discussion upon it commenced in the General Congregation of December 28. It was not till April 21, 1870, in the Twenty-ninth General Congregation, that the Constitution *de Fide* was passed, in the form in which we now know it,[2] and it received final approba-

[2] Vat. Conc., Constitutio *Dei Filius*.

tion and confirmation by the Holy See in the Third Solemn Session, held on Low Sunday. In the course of the long debates upon this Constitution, a point was raised which is of great interest to English-speaking Catholics, as touching upon a practical difficulty which is sometimes brought home to us. No part of the first chapter of the Constitution *de Fide* aroused so much discussion as did its opening words, in which the Church is designated.[3] As it now stands, the chapter opens with these words: "Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia credit et confitetur," etc.

In the *schema* as first submitted to the Fathers the first words of this chapter were simply "Sancta Romana Catholica Ecclesia." Two emendations were proposed. One Father wished to omit the word "Romana," on the ground that the expression might be taken to mean the particular Roman Church *in Alma Urbe*. Another proposed the form "Catholica atque Romana Ecclesia," or, as an alternative, the insertion of a comma between the words "Romana" and "Catholica." These emendations were in due course referred to the Deputation *de Fide*, who, however, came to the conclusion that the original words ought to stand. The Bishop of Brixen, as Relator, or spokesman of the deputation, held a dissertation before the General Congregation in which the emendations were to be put to the vote. He advised the rejection of the first emendation, and was of the opinion that there would be no danger of the name "Ecclesia Romana Catholica" being understood of the *Ecclesia Romana particularis* as distinguished from the Universal Church. With regard to the first suggestion of the second emendation, by which it was proposed to substitute the words "Catholica atque Romana Ecclesia," he also recommended that the original *wording* of the *schema* should be retained, though he saw no objection to the alternative proposal to insert a comma, since this might be a safeguard against the danger of giving any handle to those who might wish to interpret the words as designating a Roman "branch" of the Catholic Church as opposed to, *e.g.*, an Anglican or Greek branch. When the votes were taken, an almost unanimous consent of the Fathers

[3] Granderath, p. 1, ch. 2.

was obtained for the retention of the original wording;[4] but on the question of the insertion of a comma between "Romana" and "Catholica," opinions were so equally divided as to necessitate a count. While the count was proceeding, a request was made to the Presidents by several Fathers for the postponement of this point till the meeting of the next General Congregation, so that the Fathers might in the meantime have an opportunity of coming to some agreement. The request was granted, and on the following day, in the thirty-seventh General Congregation, the Bishop of Brixen again spoke on the subject, and announced that, after mature deliberation before God, and having taken counsel with many of the Fathers, amongst whom were several members of the Deputation *de Fide*,[5] he had decided to recommend the omission of the comma. He justified his change of opinion by the following explanation of the phrase "Romana Catholica Ecclesia." The words signified, he said, "The Roman Church, Mother and Mistress of all the Churches, joined with the Church Catholic, that is, with that Church which is throughout the whole world; and, indeed, so joined, that the Roman Church is Catholic, and the Catholic Church Roman."[6] He recognized, at the same time, the possibility of a difficulty on account of the error of the "Branch Theory," according to which the One True Church is divided into distinct and separate communions, which are, so to speak, different *species* of the Church Catholic; but added that this error would be sufficiently refuted in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church which would be proposed later to the Council. After this a large majority of the Fathers voted for the omission of the comma, but when, at a later stage, the Constitution *de Fide* came before the forty-fifth General Congregation for approbation *as a whole*, forty-five of the Fathers gave their "Placet" in the conditional form "*Placet juxta modum*," adding the condition that the opening words of the first chapter should be changed. Several reasons for such change were given, which one of the Fathers

[4] See Granderath, Prolog. 1, note 1.

[5] The Deputation *de Fide* included Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore, Cardinal (then Archbishop) Manning, Archbishop Leahy of Cashel, and the late Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Ledochowski.

[6] Granderath, p. 1, chap. 2, comment 1.

summarized to the following effect:[7] "The word 'Roman' is not to be approved, first, because it is unnecessary to insert it thus early in the Conciliar Decrees, since the Church will be the object of *ex professo* treatment in a later Constitution; secondly, because the word 'Roman' gives countenance to the error which distinguishes the three 'Branches' of the Catholic Church, namely, the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican; thirdly, because the same term 'Roman' is used in the Profession of Faith put forth by Pius IV,[8] to designate the *particular* Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and it is consequently an ambiguous term; fourthly, because the use of the term 'Roman' as a designation of the Catholic Church is not customary (the speaker here added '*per quantum sciam*') either in Creeds or General Councils."[9]

On hearing these reasons, the Deputation withdrew their recommendation to leave the original words of the *schema* untouched, and gave their adhesion to the formula, "*Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia*," which was, at this juncture, proposed by one of the Fathers. This secured the votes of the whole assembly with scarcely an exception. No further difficulty was raised on the point, so that in solemn Public Sessions and by Papal confirmation, the name, "Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church," became an official designation of the Church of God, approved and sanctioned by supreme authority. This sketch of the course taken by the discussion on the designation of the Church has been somewhat lengthy, but the matter is not without interest in view of the position of English-speaking Catholics in the face of Anglican claims.

The "Branch Theory" is not dead, though it is now more explicitly acknowledged than formerly by its supporters, that something else than the bare retention of valid Orders is necessary to constitute a right to the Catholic name. The appeal is now, more directly than in the past, to Catholic consent in doctrine and practice, though the only authority competent to voice that consent is still repudiated. Hence the conception of the Church's Con-

[7] Granderath, l. c. Comment 2.
[8] Denziger, *Enchiridion*, No. 867.
[9] *Ibid.*

stitution now prevalent in Anglican circles is something more like the actual reality than once it was. Nevertheless, the "Branch" theory of the Divine plan of the Church is as necessary as ever to the Anglican contention that they belong to a Church, the vast majority of whose bishops, clergy, and laity utterly repudiate such a claim. "Roman Catholic" is still a title thrown in the face of Catholics as an unwilling admission on their part of other "branches" of the Catholic Church; it is still, on various occasions, public and private, pointedly used and insisted upon in a wrong and perverted sense for the support of a pet theory. Appeal is still made to the Creeds, which call the Church "Catholic" and nothing more, while the Anglican popular controversialist still descants upon the favorite theme of "Catholic not Roman." Thus it comes about that Catholics sometimes feel a difficulty in meeting the plausible objection drawn from the addition "Roman."[10]

It is a difficulty, indeed, which is only occasionally of practical moment, and which is forced upon us by a controversial subterfuge, which, though not of the most honest sort, may perhaps be charitably excused on the score of dire necessity; still the difficulty does sometimes occur, and it is necessary to be prepared to meet it. To point out that "Roman Catholic" and "Catholic" are one and the same thing; to say, with the illustrious Bishop of Brixen, that Roman *is* Catholic and Catholic *is* Roman, is easy enough; but it is not so easy to make this clear to the supporters of a theory which depends for its very existence upon a denial of our statement. It will be of assistance to inquire into the reasons which led the Fathers of the Vatican Council to adopt the term "Roman" as an integral part of the official designation of the Church, and so overrule the not unreasonable objection that a difficulty was likely to arise from such adoption.

[10] Cf. *The Anglican Brief against the Roman Claims* (London: Moore & Brinckman, 1893, p. 4), where the objection is put thus: "To describe the same Church as 'Roman' and 'Catholic' is like describing anything as at the same time 'particular' and 'universal;' . . . the designation, '*the* Catholic Church' was only usurped by the Church of Rome when she began to usurp supremacy over other Churches. The two words, 'Roman' and 'Catholic,' are inconsistent with each other, and have two different histories. The terms are not identical, either in their origin or meaning."

All through the history of the discussion on the description of the Church there is evident a great and decided reluctance on the part of the Fathers to give up the designation "Roman." They were not moved even by the rather strong objection brought from the use of the term in another sense in the creed of Pius IV; nor did the danger of countenancing the "Branch" theory, nor the apparent novelty of the use of the word "Roman" by a Council alter their fixed determination to retain it. The only alteration of the words originally proposed to them to which they would consent, consisted, not in the omission of anything, but in the addition of the word "Apostolic" and a change of the relative position of "Roman" and "Catholic," so that the latter came first. Hence the phrase finally adopted: "The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church." That this, in view of the difficulties put before the Fathers, is an improvement on the original formula, "The Holy Roman Catholic Church," will hardly be denied.

Another fact that stands out prominently in the proceedings is that the Fathers themselves acknowledged a difficulty, and adopted the opening words of the first chapter of the Constitution *de Fide* (as they now stand) as at least sufficiently guarding against error, and as a reasonably efficient way of providing against misinterpretation. Indeed, the Conciliar designation of the Church seems to be as complete and exhaustive as possible, so that one can hardly imagine any error which could make it necessary, in any future Council, to describe the Church in terms more express and unmistakable.

All the four great traditional notes by which the true Church is outwardly and visibly distinguished from counterfeit religious bodies are included in the phrase—three of them by explicit, and one—that of Unity—by implicit mention. The Church is explicitly called Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; but when we look for the note of Unity, we find it introduced, not by mention of the note itself, but of the foundation upon which the Church's unity rests, the living, active, energizing *principle* from which it springs, by which it is maintained, and which, by its controlling force, binds the whole Church to itself as the centre, even to the utmost bounds of her world-wide circumference. This would appear to be the true significance of the retention of the title "Roman," so

strongly insisted upon by the Fathers as one of the designations of the Universal Church of God. The word implies the position of the particular Roman Church as Mother and Mistress of all the Churches of the world, in virtue of the prerogatives of her Bishops, the successors of St. Peter; it implies the fact that the essential visible unity of the Church—the *sacramentum Unitatis*—unity at once of faith, of obedience, and of inter-communion—lies in the adhesion of all to that one centre, takes its rise from that adhesion to its original and root-principle, cannot be maintained without it, and is renounced the moment such adhesion is repudiated. By a most natural and logical transference, the term "Roman" is applied to the Universal Church, which, according to the Divine plan conceived from the beginning in the Mind of Her Founder, is rendered truly and effectually *one* by subordination to the chief Pastor and the mutual inter-communion resulting from that subordination. Thus it is no stretch of language, but strictly and literally true to say, with the Bishop of Brixen, "The Roman Church is Catholic and the Catholic Church is Roman."

It may be remarked here that while this conclusion of the eminent Prelate is perfectly sound, there would appear (*pace tanti viri*) to be some confusion in his interpretation of the words "Romana Catholica Ecclesia." He does not distinguish between the two senses in which the word "Roman" can be used. It may mean either the "Particularis Ecclesia Romana in Alma Urbe," or the one Church diffused "per orbem terrarum," the essential principle of whose unity is found in communion with the Roman Pontiff. This obvious distinction is used by Fr. Perrone[11] in answer to the very objection brought by the Anglicans, that the use of the name "Roman" involves the surrender of the title "Catholic." He replies that this would be so if the name "Roman" could rightly be restricted to the Church in the Roman Diocese; but that when it is taken to signify, as it does, the Churches diffused throughout the world which are in subjection to the Roman Pontiff, preserving with him and each other the Communion of Faith and Charity, no such surrender of Catholicism is involved.

[11] *Praelect. Theol. Tract.*, de loc. theol., p. 1, cap. 3, § 283. Ed. Romae, 1841.

The intention of the Fathers of the Vatican Council in insisting as they did upon the appellation "Roman" is very well illustrated by a discussion which took place later upon the Introduction to the "Constitutio prima de Ecclesia," in which the definition of Papal Infallibility is contained.[12] The institution of the Primacy of St. Peter by our Blessed Lord is thus set forth: "Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohaerentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, Beatum Petrum caeteris Apostolis praeponens, in ipso instituit (Christus) perpetuum *utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum*, super cujus fortitudinem aeternum extrueretur templum," etc. Exception was taken by some of the Fathers to the passage which I have italicized, and, in particular, the word *principium;* nor were their scruples set at rest till the Deputation *de Fide* had gone at some length into the reasons which make the phrase not only justifiable but necessary, as a clear exposition of the relation of the Holy See to the rest of Christendom.[13] It was pointed out that both authority and theological reason were on the side of the Deputation in urging the adoption of the word "*principium*": authority, because the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, speak of the Holy See as "unitatis matrix, et radix, et nutrix," and declare that in Peter is found the very principle from which unity proceeds; reason, because all ecclesiastical authority was invested by the Divine Founder of the Church first and foremost in the person of *one* (Peter), and extended to others to be exercised by them not otherwise than in reference to and in subordination to that *one*.[14] The word "principium" was to be recommended because "the authority of Peter is not simply the passive, inactive foundation of God's Church, but a living, active, and, so to speak, *dynamic* foundation, by the ever-active force and energy of which all parts of the Church stand together and coalesce in union."[15] It is evident, then, that the appellation "Roman" is, according to the mind of the Council,

[12] Sess. IV.

[13] *Vide* Granderath, l. c. 2, cap. 2, Comment. 1.

[14] "Auctoritatem ecclesiasticam primum in unius persona constitutam in alios propogatam non fuisse nisi ea lege, ut semper ad principium suae unitatis reducatur." Relatio Rmi P. Granderath, *loc. cit.*

[15] *Ibid.*

of the highest importance and necessity, and not by any means to be rejected or disowned by Catholics. The reason of this necessity and importance is to be found in nothing else than the very error which was brought forward as one of the reasons for its exclusion. The fact that there *is* a "Branch" theory, that there *are* sects outside the unity of Peter which at least claim the title of "Catholic" (though they are, it must be admitted, diffident in actually using it without a qualification), makes it imperative that the essential necessity of union with the Holy See in order to the possession of the note of Catholicism, should be brought out in the name by which the Church calls herself.

This is but another instance of that development exhibited in all the dogmatic decrees which heresy has, in the course of the centuries, forced the Church to put forth. In the beginning no other name than "Christian" was needed to distinguish the true believer. Very early, however, in the Church's history, the rise of schisms and heresies made it necessary to distinguish between the disunion of error—which claimed the Christian name—and the perfect unity of the true Church, one over all the earth, by the adoption of the name Catholic, found apparently for the first time in the expression of St. Ignatius in his Epistle to the Christians of Smyrna: "Ubi fuerit Christus, ibi Catholica est Ecclesia." Everyone is familiar with the test given by St. Cyril of Jerusalem to his catechumens, and the argument from Catholicism with which St. Pacian refuted the Novatian Sympronian, and that of St. Augustine, who proved that the Donatists were not of the true Church from the simple fact that their communion was restricted to a corner in Africa. Very frequently the test of St. Cyril is as amply sufficient to-day as it was in his time, and his words may with perfect propriety be applied to the case of a foreign Catholic visiting, say, some large city of America or England: "If ever thou art sojourning in any city," he says, "inquire not simply where the Lord's House is (for the sects of the profane also make an attempt to call their own dens houses of the Lord), nor merely where the Church is, but where is the Catholic Church. For this is the peculiar name of this Holy Body, the Mother of us all, which is the Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ."[16]

[16] S. Cyril. Hier. Catech. xviii, 26. Card. Newman's translation of the passage *apud Development of Christian Doctrine*, ch. IV, Sec. II.

To-day also the familiar words of St. Augustine would be, probably oftener than not, literally true: "Whereas all heretics wish to be called Catholics, nevertheless not one of them would dare to point out his own Church to any stranger who asked how to find the Catholic Church." Still it has happened that the unwary Catholic, wandering into the neighborhood of an Advanced Ritualistic church, has been directed to it as the "nearest Catholic church," in the same way as the writer knows from personal experience, "Anglican Catholic Priests" have offered their ministrations—though doubtless the case is extremely rare—to unsuspecting "Romans." Under such circumstances, the only security is in the adoption of the test of St. Cyril and St. Augustine, and inquiring for the Roman Catholic church, and the Roman Catholic priest.

The development from the simple style of "Christian" to that of "Catholic," and thence also to "Roman Catholic," has been beautifully drawn out by Cardinal Newman in his *Essay on Development*, and he shows that already in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries Catholics were also known by the distinctive title of "Roman," of which he gives several instances. He records his opinion that "the word [Roman] certainly contains an allusion to the faith and communion of the Roman See."[17] Speaking of St. Augustine, the illustrious author says: "St. Augustine, then, who so often appeals to the *orbis terrarum*, sometimes adopts a more prompt criterion. He tells certain Donatists to whom he writes, that the Catholic Bishop of Carthage 'was able to make light of the thronging multitude of his enemies, when he found himself by letters of credence joined both to the Roman Church, in which ever had flourished the principality of the Apostolical See, and to the other lands whence the Gospel had come to Africa itself.'"[18] From the various passages he has adduced, the Cardinal concludes: "There are good reasons for not explaining the Gothic and Arian use of the word 'Roman' when applied to the Catholic Church and faith,

[17] *Ib.*

[18] "Unde non mediocris utique auctoritatis habebat episcopum, qui posset non curare conspirantem multitudinem, cum se videret et Romanae Ecclesiae, in qua semper apostolicae cathedrae viguit principatus, et caeteris terris, unde Evangelium ad ipsam Africam venit, per communicatorias litteras esse conjunctum."—S. Aug. Epp. XLII, Cap. III, No. 7.

of something beyond its mere connection with the Empire, which the barbarians were assaulting; nor would 'Roman' surely be the most obvious word to denote the orthodox faith, in the mouths of a people who had learned their heresy (the Arian) from a Roman Emperor and Court, and who professed to direct their belief by the great Latin Council of Ariminium."[19] One of the instances given by Cardinal Newman is brought forward also by Bellarmine.[20] Speaking of the persecution of Catholics by the vandal Theodoric who was dissuaded from putting a Catholic to death by the consideration that if he did so, "the Romans would proclaim him a martyr," Bellarmine says that "the African Catholics are here designated by the name 'Roman,' which could not have been used of them by the Arians for any other reason than that they held the Roman faith, and not the Arian perfidy."

It is true that the name "Roman," unlike that of Catholic, appears at first as having been applied to the Church by her enemies, much as "Papistical," "Romish," and "Roman" (in a wrong sense) are applied to her now; but the Catholics did not repudiate it, and, like the epithet "Homousians" given by the Arians to the orthodox, it is in truth an unwitting indication of the real whereabouts of the truth. The propagators of error, blinded by their own passionate hatred of the Bride of Christ, fix upon that point of her teaching which is directly opposed to their heresy, and endeavor to turn it into a reproach, with the inevitable result that the truth stands out the more clearly for the attacks made upon it. No more than "Catholic" can the honorable title "Roman" be in any sense a mere party designation, such as Marcionite or Arian or Donatist, Protestant Anglican or Greek "Orthodox"—so-called.

"If anywhere you hear," says St. Jerome, concluding his Dialogue against the Luciferans, "that those who are spoken of as Christians, take their name, not from our Lord Jesus Christ, but from some other,—know that they are not the Church of Christ, but the synagogue of anti-Christ;"[21] and in his Apology against

[19] *Essay on Development, loc. cit.*

[20] *De Controversiis* (De Romano Pontifice), Lib. III, Cap. XI.

[21] Sicubi audieris eos qui dicuntur Christi, non a Domino Jesu Christo, sed a quoque alio nuncupari, ut puta Marcionitas, Valentinianos — scito non ecclesiam Christi, sed anti-Christi synagogam."—*Adv. Lucif.*

Rufinus he asks, "What does he call his faith? That which the Roman Catholic Church has, or that which is contained in the books of Origen? If he says the Roman, then we are Catholics."[22] Thus just as the name "Catholic" originated in the universal and early recognition of an essential note of the only religion which possessed true *Christianity*, so, too, the name "Roman" has been adopted by the Church herself and recognized by the world at large as the proper appellation of the only religion which has any claim to true *Catholicism*.

It is a fact to-day that no one, with the exception of a comparatively small section who have a special theory to maintain, will find any ambiguity in the name "Roman Catholic," or mistake the Catholic Church for anything else than the Church which is in communion with Rome.[23]

To come now to the practical difficulty in which Catholics sometimes find themselves placed when they come into contact with our friends the "Anglo-Catholics," what is the course to be pursued? In the first place, while the name *Catholic* must be claimed by us as an amply sufficient designation, the equally honorable title of *Roman Catholic* must in nowise be repudiated. If it is used by the other side for the insinuation of the "Branch" theory, an antidote is at hand, first in the imperturbed assumption of the title Catholic by itself as exclusively the proper possession of those Churches which are in union with the Holy See; then in the distinction between "Roman" used of the Church in the Roman Diocese, and the same name used of the Church Catholic

[22] "Fidem suam quam vocat? Eamne qua Romana pollet Ecclesia; an illam quae in Origenis voluminibus continetur? Si Romanam responderit, ergo Catholici sumus," etc.—*Adv. Rufinum*, L. 1, N. 4.

[23] *Cf.* Billot, *De Ecclesia*, Vol. II, p. 202, nota 1.—"Nota quod additum *Romana* usu consecratum, minime obstat evidentiae hujus signi," (*i. e.*, the Catholic name). "Primo quia additum, quo omisso, Ecclesia nostra nondum est sufficienter designata; sufficit enim nominare *Ecclesiam Catholicam*, et statim sine ambiguitate aut aequivocatione possibili per totum mundum indigitatur," (*i. e.*, to anyone but an Anglican holding the Branch theory; and even *he* knows what is meant though he has to pretend that there is ambiguity). "Secundo quia nihil aliud significat nisi *determinatum centrum universalis illius unitatis* a qua sumptum est Catholicae nomen. [Italics mine.] Tertio quia nullam novitatem prae se fert; nam centrum Catholicitatis in Ecclesia Romana a primis initiis indubitanter agnitum fuisse, testimonia hactenus recitata manifestissime demonstrant."

throughout the world. The contention of Anglicans that "Roman" implies particularity and contradicts Catholicity, is based purely upon the studied neglect of this obvious distinction, and is nothing more nor less than controversial dust-throwing. If proof is demanded of the identity of the Catholic Church with the Church which is, throughout the world, also called "Roman," the appeal is to a known, palpable, and well-recognized fact—the fact that no other than the Church which is known as the Roman Catholic Church, and that Church alone, has the least claim to Catholicity, that is to world-wide diffusion and world-wide unity, and therefore to the assumption of the simple title "Catholic." In virtue of her Catholicity, promised to her in the beginning, realized from the first by the conversion of multitudes from every part of the civilized world; existing at all times; superabundantly evident now in the actual inclusion within her fold of some two hundred millions "of every nation and kindred and people and tongue," and by force of Divine promises, never to cease or stop till the whole earth shall have been conquered—in virtue of *such* Catholicity the Roman Catholic Church alone deserves the Catholic name. She alone may truly look upon the whole world as the theatre of her action, or, with any justice, proclaim herself free from all limitations of nationality. She alone carries out now, and has always carried out the Divine command to go into the whole world and teach all nations. As to our everyday manner of speaking of ourselves, the name Catholic, being of itself amply sufficient to indicate our faith, is also for several reasons preferable to any other, and it has the advantage of particularly insisting upon the point at issue with Anglicans, that is, upon the claim to the sole right to that title.

At the same time, if any one please to call us "Roman Catholics," we need not be at pains to correct him, unless it be clearly his intention to imply thereby that *he*, too, is a "Catholic," though not a "Roman." In that case a gentle insistence upon the fact that a Catholic and a Roman Catholic are one and the same, and a firm refusal to admit of any difference between the two, together with a just exhibition of pride in all that is included in and signified by the name "Roman" in its proper sense, will be the best and indeed the only means of defence against pertinacious

refusal or invincible inability—whichever it may be—to look at the matter from the true point of view. "Roman Catholic" we are neither able nor desirous to repudiate; "Catholic" we must exclusively claim. The former may, indeed, be sometimes of necessity to prevent misconception, but the common verdict of all mankind (except a particular class of persons with their own peculiar theory) will bear us out when we say that "Roman" takes nothing away from "Catholic," adds to it no limiting note of particularity, but simply determines it as the exclusive prerogative of that great communion whose Catholicity is one of those marks by which she is known, being already evident to all but those who will not see it. We can justly make our own and apply to both these honorable and venerated titles the words of an unknown writer of antiquity: "The Simonians are named from Simon, the Marcionites from Marcion, the Arians from Arius, and the Eunomians from Eunomius. All these and other faiths which bear the names of men, and are called after them, are not of God, nor is God in those faiths. . . . The most glorious of all our glories is the Catholic Church [and, we may add, the Roman Catholic Church], as also that we are called and named Christians, as not being named of men, but enlightened of God."[24]

H. G. HUGHES, B.D.

Shefford, England.

THE QUESTION OF A VOCATION TO THE RELIGIOUS STATE.

THE question of vocations to the Religious State is sufficiently important to engage the most careful study of confessors. Whilst I do not entirely endorse the opinion that the "settling of religious vocations" is a matter which should not be attempted by the young priest "with the oil of consecration scarce dry upon his hands," but which is to be left to the experienced pastor of souls who possesses a caution, breadth, insight into human nature not ordinarily given to youth, yet I believe that where there is question of determining a course of action which affects a person's future life, we should proceed with the utmost care.

[24] Apud Hurter, *Comp. Theol. Dogm.*, Tom. I, p. 319.

When I speak here of vocation, I exclude the question of vocation to the priesthood. I know that a special calling from God is required before a young man may present himself for entrance into the sanctuary. "Neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was. Christ Himself did not assume the election and character of High Priest, but was called thereto by Him who said: 'Thou art my son; this day I have begotten thee.'[1] St. Paul warns us against presuming to aspire to the priesthood without first receiving, as Aaron did, a Divine call: for even Jesus Christ, the Man-God, would not, of Himself, assume the honor of the priesthood, but waited till His Father called Him to it. To decide a priestly vocation, to ascertain whether a man be "called by God as Aaron was," to have a sure guarantee that he is "chosen" and "appointed" to go and bring forth fruit, is a matter not only of the highest importance, but one which requires special skill and grace.

The same sort of a vocation is not required for entering the religious state, and the question whether a person has such a vocation is less difficult of answer. It certainly does not demand any preternatural gifts of prudence and science, together with the experience of many years in the direction of souls. I maintain that any priest who has received the faculties of his Bishop to hear confessions has the right, and in certain circumstances the duty, to counsel a penitent who applies to him for advice, either for or against embracing the religious state. I go further, and disclaim the necessity of a special vocation to the religious state, believing that a general vocation suffices. I distinguish between a general and a special vocation to the religious life. By *general* vocation I understand the invitation of our Lord extended to all Christians to follow Him in the practice of the evangelical counsels. The special vocation is an act of Divine Providence by which God calls certain individuals, prompting them "fortiter et constanter" to embrace the religious state. In both vocations God gives the necessary, even superabundant graces, to fulfil the obligations of the religious state, and to secure eternal salvation. The general vocation, however, does not of itself furnish the means to practise the evangelical counsels, nor

[1] Heb. 5 : 4–5.

does it impose the obligation to enter the religious state; but the necessary graces are to be obtained by prayer. And it assures an easier way to be saved than in the world. A special vocation gives us the necessary graces for the performance of certain duties, and at the same time imposes a strict obligation to obey the divine summons, a neglect of which would endanger our eternal salvation. Speaking of this special vocation, St. Alphonsus remarks: "He who neglecting a divine vocation to the religious state, remains in the world, will hardly be saved, because God will refuse to give him, in the world, those abundant helps which He had prepared for him in religion; and although (absolutely speaking) he could be saved without these helps, yet without them he will not in fact be saved."[2]

Could a person, having good motives and barred by no serious obstacles, enter the religious state, without any special vocation, but merely following the general invitation of Christ[3] which says: "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast . . . and come, and follow Me?" Most certainly; for our Lord places no restrictions; His invitations as well as His promise of eternal reward to those who heed His invitation are *universal.*

Modern authors who insist on the necessity of a *special* vocation to the religious life maintain that as Divine Providence directs all things in the natural order in a manner proper and suitable to each, so in the supernatural order God has some particular state of life in view for each individual, leading him to his supernatural destiny. But is not this begging the question? Many theologians declare that man is entirely free in the choice of his state of life, with the exception of a vocation to the priesthood, and that God gives to each, after He has chosen his state, all the proper graces to attain the end.

Christ invited all to the practice of the Counsels; He specifies a good will as the only condition: "If thou *wilt* be perfect." But did He not likewise say: "All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given . . . He that can take, let him take it?"[4] Our Lord here refers to the vow of chastity, which requires self-denial; yet this, like the practice of mortification, is possible for

[2] *Homo Apost.*, 15, n. 28.
[3] Matt. 19: 21.
[4] Matt. 19: 11, 12.

all. The Fathers of the Church, commenting on the *Qui capere potest, capiat*, give to it this meaning,—he that is *willing* to take this counsel, let him take it courageously, and God will give him sufficient strength to keep it. Cornelius a Lapide sums up the Patristic explanation when he writes: "Here the evangelical counsel of celibacy is promulgated by Christ, and proposed to *all*, nay even counselled, but not commanded; for St. Jerome and St. Chrysostom maintain that the words: 'he that can take let him take it," are the words of one exhorting and animating to celibacy. Moreover, it is signified that, as Christ gives this counsel, it is in our power to fulfil it, if we invoke the grace of God, and earnestly coöperate with it. Nor does the expression 'he that can take,' do away with the force of this; for all that this means is, that continence is a difficult thing; and he who is willing to put restraint on himself, let such a one embrace continence, let him take it. It must be assumed, therefore, that all the faithful have power of continence, not proximately, but remotely."

Christ invited all to the practice of the evangelical counsels, as the Fathers and Doctors of the Church explain, by imposing upon themselves the obligation of a vow (*per modum voti*); for he asks a complete renunciation of self and earthly goods of those who wish to follow Him closely. One who retains the faculty (right) to marry, to possess property and personal independence, can not be said to have left all things and to follow Christ. To the practice of the Counsels a person is bound only by vow, that is, by embracing the religious state. It is this religious state, and no other, to which our Lord invites all. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me."[5] "Si quis vult," St. John Chrysostom explains, "sive mulier sive vir, sive princeps sive subditus, hanc ingediatur viam." And everyone that follows the Divine invitation shall receive his reward. "And everyone that hath left home . . . for My name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall possess life everlasting."[6]

But does not St. Paul write to the Corinthians:[7] "Every one has his proper gift from God, one after this manner and another

[5] Matt. 16: 24.
[6] Matt. 19: 29.
[7] I Cor. 7: 17.

after that"? Yes, and in the preceding verse he recommends to all Christians the single life, that is, one consecrated to God: "I would that all men were even as I myself." He counsels such a life for every one of the faithful. How could he advise it, if it were not in the power and good pleasure of everyone who asks for the necessary help from above? The general invitation to embrace the religious state is a desire of the Lord expressed to all men, a blessing offered to all; yet He foresees that the majority will pursue another course, that "not all will take this word, but they to whom it is given."[8] Christ does not mean to say that it is given to some and not to others; but He shows that unless we receive the help of grace, we have no power at all of ourselves. But grace is not refused to those who desire it; for our Lord says: "Ask and you shall receive."[9] The general vocation does not, of itself, give the immediate power to follow the evangelical counsels, as a special vocation does, soliciting the will by an interior grace; but everyone has the power to obtain it by prayer and good works. Commenting on the words of St. Paul, "Every one has his proper gift," St. Ambrose says pointedly: "Elige statum quemvis, et Deus dabit tibi gratiam competentem et propriam ut in illo statu decenter et sancte vivas." All the faithful have the "proper gift" and may follow the counsels—*in actu primo*—if they earnestly ask the grace of God and use the proper means; yet *in actu secundo*, all do not make use of it, but prefer another state of life. It is possible for all to keep the religious vows. To deny this possibility would seem to favor the doctrine of Calvinism.

It may be asked: If all are capable of choosing the religious state, how is it that the Church forbids certain persons to enter it, and that the various religious orders have approved rules and constitutions which require certain qualities in candidates, thus permitting few only to enter? I answer, the Church forbids the children of infidels to be baptized as long as they are under the dominion of their parents, and yet all are called to be regenerated at the holy font. *Bonum privatum cedere debet bono publico.* The honor of the religious state demands that certain individuals should be excluded, at least for a time. The various religious

[8] Matt. 19: 11. [9] Corn. a Lap.

orders are instituted for special ends. If a person is not admitted to a certain order, because he or she have not the necessary qualifications for that particular order, it certainly does not follow that such person is not called to the practice of the Counsels.

The discipline of the Church has been anything but opposed to the doctrine of a general vocation. Formerly parents offered little children to monasteries and convents, and when these children came of age, they were not allowed to return to the world, but were obliged to become monks and nuns. St. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, proposed the following question to the Holy See: "Si pater vel mater filium filiamve intra septa monasterii in infantiae annis sub regulari tradiderint disciplina, utrum liceat eis, postquam pubertatis annos impleverint egredi et matrimonium copulari?" Pope Gregory II answered: "Hoc omnino devitamus; quia nefas est, ut oblatis a parentibus Deo filii voluptatis frena laxentur." The Fourth Council of Toledo passed the following decree: "Monachum aut paterna devotio aut propria professio facit. Quidquid horum fuerit alligatum tenebit. Proinde his ad mundum revertendi intercludimus aditum, et omnes ad saeculum interdicimus regressus." If a special vocation had been deemed essentially necessary for the religious life, how could the Church endanger the salvation of children dedicated without their will and knowledge to such a life? The Church appeared to make salvation easy for such children by removing them from the dangers of the world and offering them special helps for their sanctification. It is admitted on all sides that if anyone make the vow of entering a convent, the obligation thus contracted can be dispensed by the Sovereign Pontiff only.

The religious state is accessible to all, and as St. Thomas of Aquin remarks, "it is a coat of mail which fits not Saul alone, but is adapted to all; with it, all may conquer and obtain the crown of eternal life."

It is certain, however, that God offers to some a special vocation to the religious state. Those who receive such a call cannot refuse to heed it without offending God, and risking their eternal salvation. Suppose a man in high station and with ample means extends a general invitation to his friends to meet him at dinner; to a few he sends a special urging by adding a postscript to the

printed invitation; "I want you to be present without fail"; to some others he sends a carriage to bring them to his house. While all are welcome at the table, the particularly invited guests are especially expected; their absence would be an insult to the host, and nothing short of a moral or physical impossibility would excuse them.

Now there are souls who clearly bear the signs of a special vocation to the higher life. The interior voice, which is God's own voice, has been telling them, since the days of childhood, that they would do *better* to enter the religious state and thereby follow more closely in the footsteps of our Saviour. In the midst of worldly pleasure and excitement they feel an aching void in their hearts; the voice is whispering that they should renounce all and follow Him. To others a special vocation comes suddenly, like a flash of lightning; a sermon, a mission, the reading of a book, a serious illness, the death of a dear one, an unexpected misfortune, or a stinging disappointment, is directing the mind and heart to Christ and His kingdom; and the serious reflections thus aroused are sometimes fostered and illumined by divine grace, and produce the solemn resolve to live for God alone. If the will remains firm and the motives pure, the marks of a special vocation are unmistakable. A confessor, though young in years and without the proverbial "experience," will have no difficulty in deciding it, provided there be none of the particular impediments by which the Canon Law of the Church safeguards the sanctity of the religious profession.

The question may arise, whether, under such circumstances, a person would be obliged to follow without delay the divine voice urging the embracing of the religious state. Some writers on the subject caution against haste in so grave a matter; they advise long and serious deliberation to make sure of the heavenly call. They have in mind the injunction of St. John,[10] "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be of God." But he who believes the spirit calling him to a religious state, believes in the spirit of God; for evil spirits will hardly induce any person to the practice of the counsels.

Still, our Lord Himself seems to insist on careful deliberation.

[10] I John 4: 1.

For, does He not say in reference to this higher state: "Which of you having a mind to build a tower, doth not first sit down and reckon the charges that are necessary, whether he have wherewithal to finish it?"[11] Yes, the building of a tower here signifies Christian perfection; the charges necessary are, according to St. Thomas, renunciation of self and earthly goods. Although there is no need of deliberation about the means (which are to renounce all things), if one desires to follow Christ, yet the important question is whether the person who experiences the divine call is willing to renounce all, one's personal will included, in order to follow Christ. Is there in the particular case a firm will to practise the Counsels? When Christ said to the youth in the Gospel, "Follow Me," the latter answered: "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father." This was a simple and apparently just request. But our Lord allowed him no delay whatever: "Let the dead bury their dead." Nor would He permit another to "take leave of them that were at his house." He sternly said: "No man putting his hand to the plough and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." The blessed Master would bear with no delay when he called His Apostles; they followed Him *continuo—statim. A fortiori*, there is less delay necessary in a vocation to a religious life.

The Fathers and Doctors teach the necessity of following promptly a special calling from God. St. Jerome uses strong words when he urges Heliodorus to break away from his family and friends: "Make haste! What are you doing under the paternal roof, effeminate soldier? . . . Even if your father were to throw himself across the threshold of your house, *per calcatum perge patrem; siccis oculis ad vexillum crucis evola. Solum pietatis genus est in hac re esse crudelem.*" He congratulated a certain Paulinus who had promptly obeyed the call of God, in the following beautiful words, which I dare not translate for fear of marring their beautiful force: "*Tu, audita sententia Salvatoris, 'Si vis perfectus esse, vade et vende omnia quae habes, et da pauperibus et veni, sequere me;' verba vertis in opera, et nudam crucem nudus sequens, expeditior et levior scandis scalam Iacob.*" Again the great Doctor says: "Make haste, and rather

[11] Luke 14: 28.

cut than loosen the rope by which your bark is bound fast to the shore."[12] The Angelic Doctor treats this question *ex professo:* "Utrum sit laudabile quod aliquis religionem ingrediatur absque multorum consilio et diuturna deliberatione praecedente" (II 2 qu. 189, a. 10). He answers in his masterly way: "Long deliberation and the advice of many are required in great and doubtful matters, but in those things that are certain and determined, no counsel is required. With regard to entering the religious state, three things may be considered: first, as to the question itself, it is certain that to enter the religious state is better than not to enter it; and he who doubts this, gives the lie to Christ who has given this counsel. Hence, St. Augustine remarks: 'Christ calls you, but you prefer to listen to mortal man subject to error.' Secondly, the strength of him who is about to enter the religious life is to be considered. Here again there is no room for doubt, because they who enter religion do not rely on their own strength, but on divine assistance, according to the words of Isaias,[13] 'they that hope in the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall take wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.' If, however, some special impediment exists, such as corporal infirmity, debts, or the like, there should be deliberation, and advice should be taken from those who are favorable to your cause, and who will not oppose it. Thirdly, the special order which one may desire to enter should be considered. In this case counsel may be sought from those who do not oppose such a holy project." St. Thomas clearly teaches that a *special* vocation to a religious life is to be followed without delay or long deliberation. "*Nescit tarda molimina Spiritus Sancti gratia.*" It is a very strange thing, St. Alphonsus remarks after reading St. Thomas, that when there is question of entering the religious state in order to lead a more perfect life, and to be more secure against the dangers of the world, people pretend that you should have to move slowly, deliberate a long time, etc.; but when there is question of accepting a higher dignity, for instance, a bishopric, where there is danger of losing one's soul, they do not urge delay or inquiry into the

[12] Festina, quaeso te, et haerentis in solo naviculae funem magis praescinde quam solve.

[13] 40: 31.

reasons for taking it. We may safely say with the Psalmist to those who have a special vocation: "To-day if you shall hear His voice, harden not your hearts." The Master is calling; hasten to follow Him. Trust in His all-powerful help.

The priest, be he young or old, who exhorts young people to enter the religious state, is likely to please God, and merit a great reward in heaven. Inducing people to quit the world and give themselves to God by the practice of the evangelical counsels is an act of supreme charity. "If we knew," remarks St. John Chrysostom, "that a place was unhealthy and subject to pestilence, would we not withdraw our children from it, without being stopped by the riches that they might heap up in it? . . . This is why we seek to draw as many as we can to the religious life." Let us follow the example of the great Doctor, and gladden the Sacred Heart of the Redeemer by exhorting willing souls to follow Him in the consecrated state. "Adducentur Regi virgines post eam: proximae ejus afferentur tibi. Afferentur in laetitia ex exultatione: adducentur in templum Regis." Frequent instructions on the religious life, and private admonition, will turn young hearts to the great Lover of Souls. It is a false and dangerous principle that young people should first get a taste of "real life" and mingle with the world before entering a convent. "He that loveth the danger shall perish in it." Experience of the world is often gained at the expense of a real vocation. The flower should be culled before its leaves begin to fade or the insects to devour its beauty. Hearts should be consecrated in the springtime of love. The Council of Trent permits young persons to take vows in the religious state at the age of sixteen, after making at least one year's novitiate. Youth is the best time to offer vows unto the Lord, and the prophet says: "It is good for a man when he has borne the yoke from his youth."

On the other hand, all those who either directly or indirectly keep persons from embracing the religious state, injure both their own souls and the souls of others. St. Alphonsus teaches that parents and others who, without a just and certain cause, prevent persons from entering the religious state, cannot be excused from mortal sin.[14] The Fathers of the Council of Trent pronounce

[14] *Homo Apost.* tract. 13, No. 25.

anathema against anyone who, without a just cause, prevents young people from embracing the religious state.

In certain cases, however, it is not only allowable to advise persons against entering the religious life, but it is the positive duty of the confessor, or spiritual director, to keep people from a state for which they have not aptitude, where they evidently will not persevere, or from which they are debarred by some canonical impediment. Moralists, and canonists especially, give a list of such legitimate impediments to entrance into religion. The principal of these are: defect of mind (unbalanced), ill-health, unsuitable age, a state of life incompatible with the practice of the religious profession, indebtedness, public infamy, necessity of supporting parents. Some of these are *juris divini;* others are *juris ecclesiastici.* They are all learnedly discussed and fully explained in the recent work on "Canon Law for Regulars" by Father Piat, the eminent Capucin canonist.[15]

The limitations and restrictions placed by the Church upon entering the convent will, when rightly observed, prevent an increasing number of ex-religious. If persons leave a convent, it is not a proof in itself that they had no vocation for the religious life, but it generally proves that they neglected to pray fervently for the grace of perseverance, or preferred a life of ease and comfort to the penitential practices of religion, or sought their own will rather than the will of God. There was nothing lacking on the part of God; but they failed in the spirit of sacrifice so essential to the religious life, and they omitted to implore it from the Giver of all good things. Such defections, however, will not disparage the superior claims of a religious life, which St. Bernard sketched accurately centuries ago: "Religious live more purely; they fall more rarely; they rise more speedily; they are aided more powerfully; they live more peacefully; they die more securely, and they are rewarded more abundantly."

Providence, R. I. WILLIAM STANG.

[15] *Praelectiones Juris Regularis*, auctore F. Piato Montensi. Tornaci: H. & L. Castermann.

CATHOLIC JOURNALISM AND THE FRIAR QUESTION.

IT is recognized on all sides that the Holy See has brought about a definite and amicable understanding regarding the attitude which our American Government is in equity bound to observe toward the Religious Orders in the Philippines.

The central facts are that the Friars hold title deeds of large estates from the Spanish Government which identify them with corresponding interests of a national character; these interests involve claims midway between Church and State that have provoked animosities and created difficulties in the restoration of civil order in various parts of the islands under American rule. To settle the extent of these claims, the civil status of the contestants, and the basis of individual freedom, by mutual and peaceful compromise, was the purpose for which the Taft Commission went to meet the Roman authorities who constitute the highest Protectorate of the Religious Orders. It was the best conceivable way of doing justice to the Friars; for the Generals of the Orders, with their Cardinal Protectors, always minutely informed of the affairs transpiring in the various houses of their Institutes, frequently meeting the Provincials who are personally appointed by them with the votes of the local Chapters, constantly sending out Visitors General to examine the condition of the various houses in every part of the world—all these reside at Rome, and submit their reports to the S. Congregation in charge of the Foreign Missions. Thus Rome was in possession of documentary evidence dating back a long time and forming a chain of light which led the way clearly to an understanding of the present condition in the Philippines and the true animus of the parties in contest. The fact that the Taft Commission went to Rome, that two of the members were elected in deference to Catholic sentiment, was in itself a guarantee that, in view of Rome's overwhelming advantages regarding the possession of dates and facts that would stand in any court of equity, matters would be arranged with every advantage to the Friars, even if there had been a disposition on the part of the United States Government to act upon a certain prejudice created by elements hostile to the Catholic Church.

The event has proved, and there is the Holy Father's and

Cardinal Rampolla's express avowal of it, that our Government was disposed not only to administer justice, but also to maintain a decidedly conciliatory spirit; which means that, if there existed at any time a misapprehension of the situation on the part of the representatives of the United States, they have exhibited no repugnance whatever to be confronted with the Catholic aspect of affairs and were disposed to alter their original views, largely based on first and necessarily imperfect impressions. In the meantime the press, both secular and religious, was busying itself with various speculations. Lacking documentary evidence, which indeed both the heads of the Friars and the hierarchical representatives who were most interested and best informed seemed *designedly to withhold*, the editors had recourse to private correspondence and telegrams from individuals who, with some show of knowledge of the actual situation, were made to sit in judgment and innocently lord it as chief arbiters. Their personal expressions were generalized, statistics supplied, details magnified into historically important events, and the whole narrative strung into an argument in which the tone of vehemence and indignation took the place not only of sound logic but also of the lacking sense of accuracy and justice.

This applies to quite a number of Catholic journals and magazines, whose editors believed it their duty to defend the badge of truth rather than the cause, seemingly forgetful that, whilst the badge stands for the cause, not every one who questions the functions exercised in the name of that badge is hostile to the cause for which it stands. Nor did these champions, picking their weapons without any discrimination, remain within the limits of reasonable defence. Some, though they had taken their messages at second hand, were fired by the zeal of the messenger who carried the news, and deemed it proper to vilify by untoward suspicions and unjustifiable inferences the conduct and character of persons who have every title to high regard not only from an official but from the Catholic or gentlemanly point of view, which I believe should manifest itself above all others in the Catholic or religious press of a free land. That the Friars had a good case so far as their claims of property right and residence in the Philippines are concerned, none need question; our Government never

did so, whatever the journals stated. If there was need to defend that case, it was not to be done with partial and badly used information, by foolish recrimination and unworthy charges of malicious and vile motives. Such a method, even if only politically viewed, is regrettable, because it is calculated to stir the indignation of a just neutral element against Catholics, who thereby appear more in the light of a clique or clan than in that of an honorable party seeking simply the defence of right.

This does not by any means imply an undervaluing of the virtue of just agitation in behalf of a good cause, for vigorous popular expression serves to act as a political warning, and to influence candidates for national honors, so that they may avoid giving needless offence to a strong party-representation. Our federated societies seem to have used this means of making Catholic influence felt, and under the guidance of prudent and responsible leaders in the Church such action is not only legitimate but thoroughly commendable, especially when that influence is being exercised not in behalf of a political party as such, but in the interests of justice and moral right and liberty of conscience. In truth, one might readily admit that Catholic journals also have contributed to this end by informing the public what the trouble was about and by eliciting sympathy for the Friars. The German Catholic Press especially, which is largely conducted with the active assistance of Religious in various Orders, was emphatic and outspoken in its vindication of the rights and privileges of the Friars, and in its condemnation of any policy on the part of our Government violating those rights and privileges. There can be no question therefore that to this extent the course of the Catholic Press, no less than that of other organs of social influence, is to be commended, for the obvious reason that as a distinctive medium of public information and popular influence it is bound to represent Catholic principle and to defend religious rights. But no amount of zeal in this direction will justify the use of poor logic, rash and foregone conclusions, based on silly reports and fictitious authorities; nor is it ever pardonable in a respectable journal to go out of its way intemperately to attack those whom we have every right to respect, or to befoul, even in general, those who are not of its own opinions. When THE

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN briefly referred to these latter methods of defence as hurtful to the Catholic cause which we in common profess to serve, and added that it would be well to spend our surplus zeal on correcting the wrongs in our own camp in the Philippines instead of palliating them when they were quite patent, our expression was taken by some readers to mean that we advocated the expulsion of the Friars, and in general disapproved of the old Religious Orders. That sort of reasoning is quite of a piece with the rabid inferences drawn by journals I have referred to, in regard to the action of the Government. These gentlemen were so full of their subject that they did not think that another person might look beyond the partisan view and place himself in the position of the stranger looking on, to whose judgment we may have, at a later period, perhaps, to defer. No official organ, unless we regard as such the secular anti-Catholic and bigoted sectarian papers, ever said that the Friars *must be expelled.* And even these "yellow" newspapers made no poorer argument than some of our own periodicals which asserted that the Friars must stay. It seemingly never occurred to them, that neither the one nor the other could possibly be the outcome of any equitable arrangement between our Government and the Friars, who might go without being expelled if their superiors saw good reason for it. And these superiors were sure to get at the reasons. Now it appears that Rome has demonstrated that the problem is best solved by neither expelling the Friars nor advocating their stay. And to that conclusion the free-lance papers, with their partial news, have contributed nothing. The Holy See as well as the Taft Commission seemed to agree, as soon as they had fully examined the actual condition of affairs in the Philippines by the light of complete information from both sides, that the Spanish Friars were, innocently or not, a real hindrance to the establishment of civil order under American rule. Quite apart from the character of the Friars, about which only the sensational newspapers, and not the official Government, seriously concerned themselves, as the State papers show, the Religious Orders would make the impending substitution of American authority a long-standing source of misunderstandings, frictions, and political discontent in the islands. For the members of these Religious

Orders had, as Father Villegas (head of the Franciscan Friars) candidly admits, taken the place of civil functionaries and of a garrison representing the Spanish power. It is not a question of rights. It is a question of facts; and as a political expedient it is futile to regard the defence of any measure which is impracticable or impossible as a right or as wise.

Now the facts, for which we need no special despatches and correspondence from Manila, are: That the Friars, of whom there is question, are in feeling and tradition Spaniards; and, unless they are of a very different mould from other human beings, their sympathies are and will for a long time to come remain Spanish, no matter what they are "said to have said" about their Americanism. This means that they will naturally dislike, if not positively distrust, the American methods of government and its representatives. We are gravely told "that not one of them has been incriminated for want of loyalty to the new order of things." One would suppose that it is rather premature to show any disloyalty to a Government which has just saved them from the violence of the natives, and keeps a large number of them still guarded in a garrisoned city. But there is no necessity of supposing the Friars to be plotters or designedly disloyal. It would be a quite new development of human nature if the instinctive and national sympathies of the Friars could be so controlled or hidden away as not to be suspected by or to influence those who have hitherto been entirely under their civil and religious sway. The Spanish clergy have the name of being a proud race, which is perhaps only the note of their inborn Castilian patriotism. The Friars have much the same blood; but we need not even assume that they care for family or country; they only need be Religious in order to draw out the sympathies of those who are really Catholics and Spaniards. Irishmen and Germans will have no need to be taught this.

If to this consideration we add the somewhat pathetic fact that the Friars and their friends may not be able to discard wholly the remembrance of lost authority, the humiliations involved in becoming petitioners where hitherto they had been lawmakers, and respected royal executives, as well as supreme counsellors of State, we have the secret of a strong sentiment which not merely

dwells in the best controlled breasts, but likewise makes its presence unconsciously known to others and invites confidence of a similar character. Altogether the position of the Friars is analogous to that of Spanish soldiers or officers, more meek perchance than these, but conquered, stripped, and yet supposed to remain in the service and under the command of the American Government, after it had made new laws and introduced an entirely new personnel, wholly different in dispositions and sympathies, in habits, in tradition, as well as in religion.

Does anyone who has read history believe that in these circumstances we have anything but the spontaneous incentives constantly to be subdued of alienation from, if not opposition to, American rule, which would create difficulties that no moral or legislative or even military power could cope with?

Certainly, if the Religious profession, which disavows all attachments to family and fatherland, could be understood simply to mean that a Friar will accept any home and position assigned him by his superior, but not that he will and can divest himself of all sense of patriotism, it would indeed be easy to settle by a word from the superiors of the Order the matter of monastic contentment amid the present difficulties in the Philippines. It is hard to believe that there exists such callousness on the part of the Spanish Religious and their adherents. But even if it were so; if every monk were disposed to make heroic efforts to smother the sleeping embers, these would soon be fanned into open flame by the restless and less controllable animosity of the natives, priests and Filipinos. The latter have shown their opposition to the Friars by killing and torturing them and driving them to flight in the face of the American soldiers who had to protect them from the fury of the natives, as we know. In view of such incidents, one is inclined to smile at the naïve confidence with which Catholic journalists quote as evidence of actual feeling, letters and despatches assuring a throng of good zealots in mass-meeting, that a million and a half or more of the inhabitants want the Friars back; and as proof we are told that one or two Spanish priests did return and were received with open arms. A great argument indeed! We should think that if the Catholicism and attachment of that million and a half are as weak as their courage was in defending the interests of the Friars when they had them,

and whilst they were backed by an American army to keep off the rebel natives, it would require abnormal confidence to place much reliance upon the invitation which according to the despatches received here they extend to the Fathers to return. In truth, the present religiousness of the Philippine population, despite the simplicity and natural goodness of certain classes in outlying districts, much as one finds it in parts of the Neapolitan or Sicilian districts, is evidently not of a very high order. The habitual conduct of the majority of the native clergy is, as we learn from the admission of the Spanish Bishops and the Provincials themselves, anything but edifying; and many of the natives excuse their lax morals by referring to the standard set up for them by the native priests. These are the ruins which should be removed; and the Spanish Friars have either not been able or were not disposed, long before the present state of affairs obtained, to remove them. Of course there were reasons for all this. But we are constrained to ask ourselves: Who put these Filipino priests in the field? Who are the Bishops that ordained them? and who the Pastors that tolerated them as their assistants in the sacred ministry, since there were practically none but Spanish Bishops and Pastors in the islands, having authority? These questions are not answered justly by the appeal to what the Friars have done for two hundred years before the opening of the last century in converting and civilizing the people of the Philippines. The plea that Abraham is our father does not prove that all of us possess Abraham's virtue; indeed it proves nothing beyond the fact that they left us a good example. A new influx of Regular priests under careful discipline and zealous activity in the spirit of the ancient foundations which the Friars recognize as their parent and model, may effect the change desired by every true son of the Church; and to say so is no disparagement of the excellent Religious who represent the different Institutes of the Friars.

It is simply folly for journalists who act as spokesmen of Catholic interests, to resort to an indiscriminate denial of the difficulties in the Philippines by an attempt to repudiate conditions which ought to be changed by a frank admission within just bounds, instead of waiting for outsiders to point them out, and drag them forth with bitter animosity. Nor does it mean that

thereby an editor constitutes himself the critic of the Spanish Hierarchy or the Religious Orders. If he have nothing good to say, let him keep quiet, but not lie. It would have been perfectly just and wise, as I said above, for the Catholic Press to insist on Catholic representation, on justice to the Catholic population, on a demand for facts, in place of mere assertions; and honest minds outside the Church would have understood this, if there had been at the same time an honest admission of the things that might need mending. All the wild outcries on the basis of the flimsiest reports, private letters, and despatches, the contents of which were generalized to an extent that simply made them falsehoods, that could only injure and create prejudice against men who have a right to their reputation, whether they are Catholics or pagans, have had no other effect than to incense these persons. And yet it must be allowed, that if scrupulousness in such matters is the duty of every publicist, it is especially that of the Catholic journalist, whose loyalty ought to allow no room for suspicion.

It may seem to many a matter of little moment that they should have used careless methods in their anxiety to defend a good cause; but we believe that these generalized charges, unless they are certainly true, when made without restraint against persons in authority, whether of the Church or State, under plea of Catholic defence, carry a far-reaching danger with them. They sow the seed of a plant which exhales the air of disrespect and opposition to all authority, and much of the shallow polemics among Catholics is responsible for that species of anarchism and secret-society scheming against Church and State for which Catholic countries of all others seem to have furnished the richest soil. Unprejudiced Catholics ask themselves: How is it possible that bishops and priests can be in seeming diametrical antagonism with each other regarding the interests of the Church in America? The answer is simple enough: Because of the exaggerated extremes to which differences are carried that, viewed in a temperate and reasonable spirit, could easily be reconciled by those who defend one and the same principle in all that concerns the salvation of souls. It is the *odium theologicum* carried into the domain of social and political life by half-informed champions who see in their own interests the interests of a common cause.

H. J. HEUSER.

PRIESTLY MINISTRATIONS IN CASES OF FEBRILE DISEASE AND DELIRIUM.

"Infirmatur quis in vobis? inducat presbyteros Ecclesiae et orent super eum unguentes cum oleo in nomine Domini."—Jacob. 5: 14.

THE subject of contagious diseases has been treated at length in former numbers of the REVIEW.[1] To discuss, therefore, the risks incurred by a priest in attending sufferers from such diseases; or, again, the precautionary measures to be taken by him at such times, is not the subject of this paper. Its scope is, rather, to set forth such leading symptoms of certain common fevers as may enable him to discern the kind of fever the sick person is suffering from,—the existing danger of death, and the course to be pursued for the spiritual welfare of the patient. For the benefit of the neophyte this article will also include solutions of certain difficulties which may crop up in connection with the administration of Holy Communion and the anointing of the sick.

To be able to judge the precise fever a sick man is suffering from and to recognize the danger of death that may exist at the time is of great importance to the priestly ministrant. Equipped, indeed, with a knowledge of the main symptoms of the different common fevers, and of diseases commonly met with in pastoral work, a priest will be thereby forewarned of the danger of delirium—a valuable guide in the administration of the last rites.

As regards febrile diseases, then, I will begin by pointing out that an undefined fever is known to medical men as "pyrexia," an essential condition and concomitant of a person in any fever. The very term, therefore, implies the presence of certain criteria that will reveal, in time, a definite form of disease.

We see a difference between this condition and that known as "hyperpyrexia," which occurs in diseases not included under the head of fevers, as erysipelas and pneumonia. Indeed in any disease when the temperature of a person attains to 105° or 106° Fahr., the feverish state would be termed "hyperpyrexia." Broadly speaking, the usual indications of a feverish state may be stated to be an abnormal temperature, dry skin, and a quick, full-bounding pulse; though additional phenomena may appear to determine the exact kind of fever that has been contracted,

[1] See April and May numbers, 1899.

such as sore-throat, rash, and pains in the head. But the first named symptoms are always observable in diseases classed under the head of "fevers." What is called a "rigor" is an early sign of fever. It is more severe in some cases than in others. Again, we have often evidence of the outset of fever in the chattering of the teeth, feeling of lassitude, weakness of limbs, and bruised feeling of different members of the body. We find these last symptoms in what is known as influenza. Small-pox is accompanied at the outset by shivering; this occurs also in the primary stage of typhoid. These premonitory signs, however, will naturally develop before the priest is summoned to the sick-bed; hence what must be especially noted is the high temperature—the natural concomitant of fever. It will not be out of place, therefore, if I remind the reader that the normal temperature of a person in good health is 98.4° Fahr., and as a rise above that indicates fever, it may be said that 100° is a sign of fever. Should the rise be to 103°, it is severe; a temperature of 104° gives cause for alarm; and if it attains 105°, it is very severe; at 106° it may be regarded as very hopeless, if maintained; at 107°, practically fatal. In the last mentioned cases, however, the danger is lessened if the patient be attended by a trained nurse, since an abnormally high temperature is often speedily reducible by means of tepid sponging. *Ad cautelam*, nevertheless, I would say that when a priest is called to attend a man, on the district, whose temperature has attained to 105°, he will do well to anoint and administer Holy Viaticum. Even in a hospital, when a similar temperature is maintained, he should administer the last rites. In some fevers, however, the temperature varies. For example, in measles the ordinary temperature is 103°; while in cases of small-pox it rises to 104° and 105° at the beginning. Whenever the temperature of a person has reached 106°, it would be folly to delay the administration of the last rites, as far as the condition of the sufferer will allow.

It is worth noticing that a state of fever means increased pulsation involving a strain upon the heart, hence in pneumonia subjects as also in cases of delirium tremens there is a danger of heart collapse. In maturity the pulse-beats should be *about 75;* wherefore, should they be found to be 130 or 140, serious

danger is evident. But experience testifies that "sweating" is no certain index to the temperature. For this is often the result of weakness, as is seen commonly in rheumatic patients and also in those afflicted with phthisis.

In medical science fevers are sometimes called "continued"; sometimes "intermittent," and again "remittent." A fever is called by the first name when the temperature rises and continues high for a length of time; it receives the second name when the high temperature falls and rises and *vice versa*—first up and then down, and so on; it is known as "remittent" when the fever is such that the temperature leaps down considerably and then leaps back again—commonly witnessed in cases of typhoid. And here we may draw a distinction between what are known as contagious and infectious fevers. As coming under the head of infectious diseases may be mentioned measles, scarlet fever, small-pox and typhoid. The last named is, as a rule, infectious only to the nurse or one waiting upon the patient. It often happens that in large infirmaries a typhoid may be among many patients without danger to them. Scarlet fever and small-pox are *par excellence* contagious. In diphtheria we behold a combination of the two; for it is both one and the other. Hence, the advisability of hearing the confession of a diphtheric patient, of keeping one's face averted from him to avoid any sputum or saliva that may be spluttered out. Scarlet fever and small-pox are known as epidemics by reason of their being air-borne.

As to the course run by fevers, it varies in different febrile diseases. Typhoid lasts thirty days, death ensuing in fatal cases during the third or fourth week. In scarlet fever a change for the better may sometimes be witnessed at the termination of the first week.

The rash is the distinguishing characteristic in fevers. But as a priest has to content himself with a superficial examination, this differentiating feature is better known to the medical man. In some cases, nevertheless, it is visible to the priest, notably in small-pox, since the rash appears on the forehead, face, and wrists. It is often observable in typhoid cases on the chest.

As one of the commonest fevers met with by a priest is typhoid, it may be well for me to describe more particularly the

symptoms of this dangerous disease. Typhoid is recognized by (1) high fever; (2) headache; (3) coated tongue, circled by red; (4) lying on back in state of lassitude; (5) knees being drawn up; (6) hectic flush on the cheeks; (7) deafness; (8) and frequently by spots on the chest.

This dangerous fever, sometimes called "enteric," is infectious, not contagious. It is like to cholera and dysentery, and so it is distinguishable from "typhus," which is contagious and air-borne and bears a likeness to scarlet-fever and small-pox.

It should be particularly noticed that when alcoholism is connected with typhoid, there is always grave danger; so that, while patients over fifty years of age are less able to battle with this disease, even younger persons, say of twenty or thirty years of age, if they have been heavy drinkers, have the chances of recovery against them. Whenever, therefore, a priest is aware that he is attending a typhoid patient who has been a heavy drinker, he should always administer the last rites as early as possible. And as it is with typhoid, so with pneumonia and erysipelas. Again, when there is hæmorrhage from the bowels or when the temperature attains 105° and is persistent, there is every reason for the priest to administer the last Sacraments. In the majority of cases death is the result of excessive fever.

A word now upon diphtheria and puerperal fever. For our purpose we may place diphtheria under the head of fevers. It is both contagious and infectious, being an epidemic and contagious sore-throat accompanied with exudation of false membranes on the tonsils. The general symptoms are low spirits, headache, sleepiness, chilly feeling, high temperature, quick-beating pulse, and flushed features. In diphtheric patients there is a difficulty in giving Holy Viaticum on account of the state of the tonsils. Often it is best not to try to administer It.

In speaking of puerperal fever, I would preface my remarks with the observation that this is a fever of which a knowledge is most useful for a priest. It is engendered by the condition of the blood after parturition. In this delicate condition a woman is liable to septicæmia or blood-poisoning, and it may be brought about by scarlet-fever, or any other fever, as well as erysipelas; but, it must be observed, it can easily be induced by infection. For this reason

a priest should be especially careful not to go straight from a maternity ward or any other lying-in case, if he can possibly avoid it, to offer the consolations of religion to any other woman who is near her confinement, or who has given birth to a child less than three months before. The danger, of course, is not to the priest, but to the woman who, under such delicate conditions, is exposed to septicæmia.

In fatal cases it may be said the disease assumes a typhoidal condition. To conclude: just as in apoplectic fits, a priest should always anoint on account of the uncertainty of the issue; so, too, in puerperal fever cases the person so afflicted should be comforted with the last Sacraments on account of the existing danger. Hyperpyrexia and delirium are the concomitants of this disease.

This brings us, therefore, to the subject of delirium. In all fevers strictly so-called, owing to the high temperature, there is danger of delirium, more or less noticeable. Not seldom the person may become very delirious during the night-time and regain reason soon after daybreak. One sees this often in pneumonia cases. And this leads me to remark that the statement of O'Kane [2] that, "in all diseases where there is any reason to apprehend delirium, the priest should endeavor to administer the last Sacraments as early as possible," requires qualification. He tells us that Holy Viaticum should only be administered in cases of *probable* danger of death. Hence so far as *probability* of death is concerned, Holy Viaticum follows the same rule as Extreme Unction. Now there are many cases in which delirium may occur without there being any *probable* danger of death. We see instances of this in stubborn constipation and cellulitis. In many pneumonia patients the crisis does not happen till about the fifth day, and if it be a case of a young man, say thirty years of age, who has led an abstemious life, the chances are in his favor. In the cases therefore under contemplation it would seem that the right course to follow would be for the priest to hear the sufferer's confession and to administer Holy Communion, if possible, and await results. In the case of a pneumonia patient who had been addicted to drink, the duty of a priest is to administer the last Sacraments, as then there is always probable danger of death.

[2] *Rubrics* 327, § 781.

With regard to those in delirium, authors assert that Holy Viaticum may be given to them, provided it is known that they have lived good lives. But even in this case it is well to test the patient with an unconsecrated particle by way of guarding against possible irreverence.

Now I shall set down a list of diseases in which delirium is usually found or may arise, and make a few comments on the different diseases specified. I begin with what are strictly called fevers:

Typhoid Fever.—When temperature is 105° and continued, or when there is hæmorrhage from the bowels, always administer the last rites of the Church.

Typhus Fever.—A person suffering from this kind of fever should always receive the last Sacraments, owing to its deadly character.

Scarlet Fever.—Patient should receive all consolations of religion when temperature of 105° is persistent and breathing remarked to be very labored.

Rheumatic Fever.—The pulse to be especially noted. When it is very rapid and breathing is irregular and fitful, there is reason to administer the Sacraments, especially when pericarditis is feared.

Puerperal Fever.—Always give last Sacraments, owing to uncertainty of issue. In this case there is hyperpyrexia and consequent delirium, and in fatal stage it assumes typhoid condition.

Brain Fever.—Temperature should be carefully watched. In bad forms the patient is squint-eyed. Best for priest to do all he can for the sufferer, owing to the large proportion of deaths from this disease.

Among other diseases not strictly coming under the head of fevers in which delirium occurs or may occur may be enumerated:

Pneumonia.—This is recognized by the rusty-colored sputum, quick-beating pulse, high temperature, with quick respiration. Priest should especially notice signs of cyanosis. Advisable to anoint and give Holy Viaticum to a patient over fifty years of age. This should always be done in case of alcoholic subjects. In pneumonia there is danger of heart-failure if very severe.

Delirium Tremens, induced by drink.—Temperature to be

watched. If accompanied by pneumonia, all should be done at once for the patient; great strain involved upon the heart.

Influenza.—Look for dusky appearance of face. This shows heart affection and with high temperature is a very bad omen. In such a case all should be done for the spiritual welfare of the afflicted.

Erysipelas.—High temperature dangerous. If an alcoholic subject, chances of recovery are against the person.

Empyema.—If patient shows persistent high temperature and exhaustion, do all.

Pyæmia.—There is here often danger of pneumonia.

Diphtheria.—In such patients there is great difficulty in swallowing and consequently danger of suffocation. Great caution is required in administering Holy Viaticum. In severe cases the Holy Viaticum is best omitted. In instances that call for the operation known as tracheotomy, the sick person should certainly be anointed.

Phthisical Mania.—Owing to the advanced stage of phthisis in which this occurs, patient should always be anointed.

Pericarditis.—Of common occurrence in rheumatic fever. Swelling of feet and legs, irregular pulse, and cyanosis, call for immediate attention of the priest. In cases where pulsation is 140, there is distinct danger.

Acute Bronchitis.—When there are high temperature and labored breathing and conspicuous cyanosis, the priest should administer the last consolations of religion.

Diabetic Mania.—Note thirst; severe thirst is a dangerous symptom.

Cellulitis.—Often accompanied by pleuro-pneumonia, sometimes delirium; general marks of acute septicæmia.

Gangrene.—If of the lungs, generally fatal; conspicuously fœtid breath. Hence the attending priest should be careful not to inhale the obnoxious breath of such a patient.

In concluding this paper it is proposed to answer some of the difficulties that may arise in connection with Extreme Unction and the administration of the Holy Viaticum.

1. Must a person be anointed *sub conditione* who has been

absolved conditionally on account of doubtful dispositions? This is a question that may have suggested itself to some of the readers of the REVIEW in the course of their priestly ministrations. Father Lehmkuhl[3] says on this matter, "Neque adjici debet *conditio.* 'Si dispositus es'; extrema unctio enim *absolute* conferri debet, si homo capax est unctionis sacramenti valide recipiendi, sub conditione tum tantum, quando dubium est, num valide recipere possit."

One would administer the Sacrament of Extreme Unction *sub conditione*, therefore, (*a*) when there is a doubt as to whether the person is dead or alive; (*b*) when it is doubtful whether a child has arrived at the use of reason; (*c*) when it is doubted whether the person ever enjoyed the use of reason. To give Extreme Unction *absolutely* under such circumstances would be to endanger the *valid* administration of the Sacrament. But when it is a question of the *doubtful dispositions* of the recipient, the rule is either to anoint *absolutely* or not at all. A man cannot be anointed "si constet de indispositione." But when it is not certain that he is indisposed, the Sacrament must be given *absolutely.* Hence it follows that should one discover after anointing a sick person that the Sacrament had been received in bad dispositions, such a one should not be anointed again, "in eodem periculo mortis," for the reason that "gratia reviviscit"—the Sacrament having been received "valide sed informe." Since Extreme Unction can only be received once "in eodem periculo mortis," it is classed in this respect with Confirmation, Marriage, and Holy Orders, in which cases the Sacrament would not be repeated, though received in mortal sin.

Concerning this matter St. Alphonsus says in answer to the question, "An possit dari hoc sacramentum validum sed informe, ita ut recedente obice gratia conferatur?" "Affirmant *communiter* Suar. Dicast. Salmant. Croix. Palm.," etc. Again he says, "Hinc inferunt Salmanticenses (ibiden cum aliis) quod si infirmus bonâ fide vel sensibus destitutis, sacramentum *suscepit in mortali* sufficit quod postea attritionem habeat ad gratiam recipiendam; secus in mala fide. Id autem currit, si obex tollatur perseverante eodem morbo et periculo; saltem quoad effectum specialium auxiliorum."

[3] *De Ext. Unct.*, p. 406, § 577.

To sum up. If a man receive Extreme Unction *in mortali*, and his bad dispositions were not culpable at the time ("bona fide vel sensibus destitutis"), attrition afterwards would be sufficient to make the "reviviscentia gratiae"; if, however, his bad dispositions were culpable at the time, more than attrition would be necessary for "reviviscentia," i. e., *perfect* contrition or the Sacrament of Penance. In either case there would be "reviviscentia." Hence it becomes clear that all this teaching is practically ignored, if the Sacrament of Extreme Unction be imparted conditionally on account of doubtful dispositions of the person to be anointed, because, then, there could be no "reviviscentia" of something, which by the very hypothesis of the case had never been given at all.

2. Our next question is: What must be done in reference to the Paschal precept when a person is not in danger of death, yet cannot fast? When a person is suffering from a disease which does not expose him to a danger of death, yet is a lingering one, Holy Communion cannot, says Father Lehmkuhl, be given to one *not* fasting; although the sick person cannot remain long without food. But this is a reason, nevertheless, why *sometimes* Holy Communion should be given shortly after midnight. For the law which prohibits the administration of Holy Communion before (five o'clock), yields to the still graver law which enforces the reception of Holy Communion sometimes. The law, again, respecting the hour of administration is not so serious or binding as the law of fasting.

Let me quote Father Lehmkuhl's words:[4] "Si autem morbus diuturnus quidem, sed nullatenus letalis est, S. Eucharistia non jejuno dari nequit, etsi aegrotus sine cibo diu manere non potest; at haec est ratio, cur aliquoties media nocte vix elapsa ad eum deferri possit vel etiam debeat. Nam lex Eucharistiam non noctu deferendi ecclesiastica est neque adeo gravis; sumendam esse aliquando Eucharistiam, legis divinae interpretatio est; neque ullo modo ecclesia censetur fideles aegrotos adstringere velle, ut potius non recipiant S. Sacramentum, quam ut noctu aliquoties in anno recipiant."

As regards people receiving Holy Communion not fasting in order to satisfy the Paschal precept, "auctores scinduntur." For

[4] P. 117, *De Euch.* sect. 161–2.

instance, Elbel and Witasse maintain that Holy Communion can be given to one not fasting, but only *occasionally;* whereas Toletus and Tournely assert that it can be given when there is urgent cause, *e. g.*, Paschal Communion.[5] Nevertheless it would appear that if the opinions of theologians were weighed in the balance, the weight of authority would be on the side of those who forbid the practice of giving Holy Communion to those not fasting, even for the fulfilment of the Paschal precept, since in such a case so long as a person could not fast, the obligation ceases in his regard. The best authorities suggest that the course to pursue is to take Holy Communion to such a one immediately after midnight. Like Lehmkuhl, the best authorities would seem to maintain that Holy Communion can only be administered to one not fasting when there is probable danger of death. As regards the administration of Holy Viaticum, it can always be given to those not fasting, when fasting would give rise to any inconvenience.

3. Another practical question is, into how many parts may one Host be divided. If we go to Lehmkuhl, we find him saying[6] "licet tamen, si necessarium est, parvas hostias dividere, sed *summum* in duas vel tres partes, ne particula nimis parva evadat." A consecrated particle, therefore, may not be divided into more than *three* parts. In Ireland, I believe, people will fast in order to receive Holy Communion, when they get wind of the fact that a priest is going to communicate a neighbor, *e.g.*, in time of the Jubilee.

4. Another question is this: Is it lawful, by reason of inconvenience, to give two Hosts, to one person, *per modum unius?* A decree expressly approved by the Holy See has been issued concerning this matter, S.C.C., Feb. 12, 1679, ab Innoc. XI, "neque *plures* hostiae parvae dandae sunt."[7] Wherefore it may be stated that the inconvenience of having to carry back the Blessed Sacrament a considerable distance, for example, does not justify the administration of two hosts *per modum unius.* It must be done in this case as in others—for instance, when a priest finds a person had broken his fast, or is seized with vomiting, or when only a

[5] *Vide* O'Kane: *Rubrics*, p. 375.

[6] P. 100, § 138.

[7] *Vide* Lehmkuhl, p. 100, sec. 138.

portion of a Host can be administered, he would have to take the Blessed Sacrament back again. Distance, then, or singular inconvenience would not warrant the violation of the above decree. The difficulty that at times arises of having to carry the Blessed Sacrament about with one, even for some time, and in the public wards of a hospital, is only part and parcel of what is unavoidable in a missionary country,—I mean the taking of the Blessed Sacrament to the sick without any of those public external signs of reverence which are due to so august a mystery and which are strictly prescribed for a Catholic land.

5. Is there any obligation for a person to receive Holy Viaticum if he is seized with a mortal sickness soon after receiving Holy Communion?

Let us again consult Father Lehmuhl. He says:[8] "Qui subito in mortis periculo constituitur non *certo* tenetur ad sumendam Sacram Eucharistiam, quando circiter una ante hebdomada Communionem sumpsit, *maxime* si mortis periculum ex causa intrinsecus orta creatur, quae jam tunc praeparata erat. Verum *potest* pro viatico etiam ille Sacram Communionem sumere, qui eodem die, mortis periculo nondum ullatenus apparente, Sacram Communionem ex devotione sumpsit atque postea in mortis periculo inopinato constituitur, quamquam *minime* tenetur."

A person, therefore, who has communicated within a week is under no obligation to receive Holy Vaticum, especially when the danger of death has arisen from some intrinsic cause; but such a one *may* receive Holy Viaticum, even though he has received Holy Communion the same day.

ALFRED MANNING MULLIGAN.

Birmingham, England.

WHAT ARE WE TO THINK OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM?

THIS question has been asked many scores of time and will continue to be asked for many a long year. The rise of modern spiritualism is within the memory of most. Commencing in New York in the Fox family, it spread over Europe very

[8] Vol. II, p. 106, § 146, sec. 4.

rapidly, so that in the year 1853 it could be described as an epidemic. Contact with the unseen world exercises a strange fascination over the human mind, and modern spiritualism seemed to offer an easy means of communicating with the spirit world, the existence of which is so deeply ingrained into our nature. It would be hazardous to attempt to estimate the number of people who frequent *séances*, just as it would not be easy to count the magazines and periodicals devoted to spiritualism and which exercise a most active propaganda in its behalf.

When first in vogue, much hostile criticism was evoked and many were sceptical to the last degree; but the early enthusiasm died away, and with it the early hostility it had evoked. But spiritualism had come to stay, and nowadays must be looked upon as an accepted fact. With many it has become a passion as inveterate as gambling; for many it serves in lieu of more healthy religious feeling; and in others it evokes merely passing curiosity.

Before we can answer the question, What are we to think of modern spiritualism? we must clearly understand what it is.

The Society for Psychical Research.

In 1882 the Society for Psychical Research was instituted, and thus announced its object in its opening manifesto: "It has been widely felt that the present is an opportune time for making an organized and systematic attempt to investigate that large group of debatable phenomena designated by such terms as mesmeric, psychical, and spiritualistic."

Six committees were established with the object of undertaking certain special fields of inquiry. Of these special questions, Nos. 1 and 5 concern us most nearly: "1. An examination of the nature and extent of any influence which may be exerted by one mind upon another, apart from any generally recognized mode of perception. 5. An inquiry into the various psychical phenomena commonly called spiritualistic; with an attempt to discover their cause and general laws."

After fifteen years of work, during which were published several volumes of reports, a summary of the results obtained was drawn up in 1897 by Mr. Frank Podmore, and published under the title of *Studies in Psychical Research.*

The inquirers have endeavored to marshal as large a body of reliable facts as possible, and in many cases they have laid bare a series of astounding frauds, and—what is more interesting—have found that the most difficult point with which they had to deal was the unconscious fraud. There lies latent in the human character in every walk of life an often unsuspected "anxiety to shine." Reason may suppress it; waking thoughts may make us blush for it; but it is there none the less, and reappears all too surely in those states which may be described as "automatic" or "somnambulic" consciousness. The real source of error, the investigators say, "is the sub-conscious sophistication of the record owing to the instinctive tendency of the imagination to dramatic unity and completeness."

At the same time these inquiries have brought them into contact with many strange events and with many uncanny tales that demanded an explanation. Apparitions, wraiths, premonitions, seemingly supernatural powers, trances, phenomena of consciousness, which were beyond the region of fraud, were either to be suppressed or explained on some philosophical system; or, if the worst came to the worst, accepted as real manifestations of the supernatural.

Here we are concerned solely with the facts brought forward n favor of spiritualism and with the explanations of them proposed by the investigators on the part of the Psychical Society.

Spiritualistic Séances.

The main features in the spiritualistic manifestations may be grouped under the heads of—(*a*) apparitions of materialized spirits, *i. e.*, spiritual beings seemingly rendered visible by material envelopings; (*b*) predictions of the future; (*c*) minute knowledge of the past or present of members of the auditory; (*d*) levitation of the human body, as in the case of Daniel Home, whose body was said to be frequently raised from the ground; (*e*) strange sounds due to no known cause, such as the playing of musical instruments as they floated, untouched by human hands, through the air; also remarkable knocks and rappings often accompanied by strange antics on the part of the furniture; and, lastly, (*f*) a marvellous power over natural forces, such as fire; this seems to have

been possessed by several "mediums." All these things were of common occurrence at the *séances*, and might be varied to any extent.

Their frequent occurrence, their startling nature, the knowledge displayed of many occult things, enabled the spiritualists to maintain that they were due to the spirit-world with which they professed to be in contact. With many it became a species of religious mania, more especially when answers were returned which inculcated a certain morality, and which further averred that this life was but a transitory state of preparation for another or spirit life.

Apparitions.

Let us, first of all, examine the class labelled "apparitions." It would be folly to deny that these have taken place at *séances*. Men of culture and integrity have testified to their occurrence. How, then, can they be explained? Are they realities? To take a case in point. When a mother is induced to go to a *séance* in order to see her recently-deceased child—if she is allowed to see it, does she see a reality, or is there some illusion? Waiving for the moment the element of fraud, one of three answers may be returned to this question. First, it may have been an ocular illusion; but this is only to put the difficulty further back. An illusion may arise from the state of the blood, or from the state of the nerves. Violent migraine will often make us visionaries for a time. Or it may be that a tiny clot of blood in one of the vessels of the eye distorts our vision, as Sir Lauder Brunton recently explained in the *Journal of Mental Science* (April, 1892). But this will not explain a persistent sensation, nor one which is shared in by many simultaneously. Must we then answer that it is a reality? May it not be something real, *i. e.*, something objectively outside of us, yet not what it purports to be? If we grant the existence of the spirit-world, can we not readily conceive that spirits may clothe themselves with material forms, and thus render themselves visible and palpable to us? Could they not, moreover, assume the forms which we wish to see, and thus deceive us into thinking that we really did see them?

Telepathy.

Another answer, however, has been suggested which needs careful examination. There is a force whose existence we cannot reasonably doubt, namely, telepathy, a force by which one mind can be acted on by another mind without any physical contact, even though the distance between the two minds be very great; indeed, the distance seems to have no retarding or minimizing influence upon this peculiar action. We have a very practical though very ordinary instance of telepathy in the disconcerting fact that when we have turned round to have another look at the man who has just passed us in the street we find that he, too, has turned round to have just another look at us. The same electrical influence, if we may so call it, may be the explanation of many feelings which we class as premonitions. Cases are certainly not rare where persons have suddenly, and for no explicable cause, thought of some one dear to them and felt a strange unaccountable feeling that all was not well with them, a prevision which has sometimes been proved to be well-founded. This may also be the explanation of what are known as "wraiths"—those sudden appearances of persons lately dead, or just at that moment dying—to others who are dear to them. It *may be* that the mind of the dying person is so deeply occupied with the thought of the absent one, that at the moment when the bonds of the flesh are about to be loosed, the mind, hardly contained within its own tenement, has a redoubled power of acting upon the absent one, and thus suddenly appears to him. We say advisedly *may be*, for we feel that this explanation of "wraith" is quite inadequate.

It should be further remarked that this action of mind upon mind is not always merely unconscious, but can at times be deliberately induced, and a remarkable instance of this is given in the *Records of the Society for Psychical Research:*

"*V.—From the Rev. Clarence Godfrey.*

"I was so impressed by the account on p. 105 that I determined to put the matter to an experiment.

"Retiring at 10.45 (November 15, 1886) I determined to appear, if possible, to a friend, and accordingly set myself to work with all

the volitional and determinative energy I possess, to stand at the foot of her bed. I need not say that I never dropped the slightest hint beforehand as to my intention, such as could mar the experiment, nor had I mentioned the subject to her. As 'agent' I may describe my own experiences.

"Undoubtedly the imaginative faculty was brought intensely into play, as well as the volitional, for I endeavored to *translate myself*, spiritually, into her room, and to attract her attention, as it were, while standing there. My effort was maintained for perhaps eight minutes, after which I felt tired and was soon asleep.

"The next thing I was conscious of was meeting the lady next morning (*i. e.*, in a dream, I suppose?) and asking her at once if she had seen me last night. Her reply came 'Yes.' 'How?' I inquired. Then in words strangely clear and low, like a well audible whisper, came the answer, 'I was sitting beside you.' These words, so clear, awoke me instantly, and I felt I must have been dreaming; but on reflection I remembered I had been 'willing' before I fell asleep, and it struck me 'This must have been a reflex action from the percipient.' My watch showed 3.40 A.M. . . ."

Mr. Godfrey received from the percipient on the 16th of November an account of her side of the experience, and at his request she wrote as follows:

"Yesterday, viz., the morning of November 16, 1886, about half past three o'clock, I woke up with a start and an idea that some one had come into the room. I heard a curious sound, but fancied it might be the birds in the ivy outside. Next I experienced a strange restless longing to leave the room and go downstairs. This feeling became so overpowering that at last I arose and lit a candle and went down, thinking that if I could get some soda water it might have a quieting effect. On returning to my room I saw Mr. Godfrey standing under the large window on the staircase. He was dressed in his usual style and with an expression on his face that I have noticed when he has been looking very earnestly at anything. He stood there, and I held up the candle and gazed at him for three or four seconds in amazement, and then, as I passed up the staircase, he disappeared. The impression left on my mind was so vivid that I fully intended waking up a friend who occupied the same room as myself, but remembering that I should only be laughed at as romantic and imaginative, refrained from doing so." [1]

[1] *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 258.

Is Telepathy an Adequate Explanation?

Granting the absolute veracity of this incident—and we see no reason to doubt it—it is clear that brain can act upon brain even at will, although this is certainly of rare occurrence and probably restricted to highly electrical or magnetic individuals. But does this solve the question of apparitions at spiritualistic *séances?* Can these rare manifestations of thought-transference—wonderful proofs as they are of telepathy—can they suffice to explain the constantly recurring, and not isolated, cases of apparitions seen, not by one person, or once, or for a fleeting moment, but for a considerable space, by many people assembled together in a room? Can they explain the fact that all see the same object independently of the state of their brains or nerves? Will they serve to explain apparitions which are summoned at will and which moreover speak and convey connected information? We feel, for instance, that neither telepathy nor its correlative, thought-transference, will explain such a case as the following:

"W. L. (July, 1888), butler, entered Mr. Z.'s service in October, 1885. Was much disturbed from the outset by loud noises—as of barrels rolling about, doors banging, men wrestling together, etc. On March 9, 1886, when coming out of the library, he saw a figure standing before him dressed in a brown garment with two tassels at the side. The head could not be seen, only a black mist in its place. He turned to run away, and felt a cold touch, as from a cold hand, on his left side, and was ill for the rest of the day. Later, when decorating the dinner-table with flowers, he looked up and saw the same figure. Some weeks later Mr. and Mrs. Z. and a few friends tried table-turning. W. L., coming up with the grog-tray, saw the same figure again.

"The spirit communicating through the table then promised to appear at 11 P.M., one evening in the drawing-room, and W. L. was requested to be present. The gas was turned low and the drawing-room door left open. As the clock struck 11, 'it' walked slowly in. The dress was of the same shape as the apparition seen by W. L., with large loose sleeves and two tassels. It seemed as if made of light Japanese flowered silk. The face was haggard-looking, with a long, thin nose; the hair fair and hanging over the shoulders. The figure remained for some minutes; disappeared when the gas was turned up;

and then re-appeared. W. L. followed the figure to the cellar, and the spirit indicated that treasure was buried there. Two days later, when W. L. was in the cellar, the figure again appeared, and indicated the precise spot where the treasure was concealed. The floor of the cellar was dug up, but no treasure was found. . . . At the *séances* seven persons were present. Of these, three saw the figure. The figure appeared at the *séances* on four different occasions. . . . So far as Mrs. Z. knew, all three saw the same figure. Mrs. Z. saw the face distinctly, and subsequently recognized it in a photograph of a lady who had lived in the house a few years previously. Mrs. Z. did not come to the neighborhood until some years after this lady's death, and had never previously seen her or any picture of her."[2]

We may also give here an exceedingly curious instance of an apparition of one living person to another. It is attempted to explain it as due to telepathy, but with what success is doubtful.

"*From Frances Reddell.*

"ANTONG, TORPOINT, DEVONSHIRE.

"December 14, 1882.

"Helen Alexander (maid to Lady Waldegrave) was lying here very ill with typhoid fever, and was attended by me. I was standing at the table by her bedside pouring out her medicine, at about four o'clock in the morning of October 4, 1882. I heard the call-bell ring (this had been heard twice before during the night in that same week), and was attracted by the door of the room opening, and by seeing a person entering the room whom I instantly felt to be the mother of the sick woman. She had a brass candlestick in her hand, and a red shawl over her shoulders, and a flannel petticoat on, which had a hole in front. I looked at her as much as to say, 'I am glad you have come,' but the woman looked at me sternly as much as to say, 'Why wasn't I sent for before?' I gave the medicine to Helen Alexander, and then turned around to speak to the vision, but no one was there. She had gone. She was a short, dark person, and very stout. At about six o'clock that morning Helen Alexander died. Two days after, her parents and sister came to Antong, arriving between one and two o'clock in the morning. I and another maid let

[2] *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 315.

them in, and it gave me a great turn when I saw the living likeness of the vision I had seen two nights before. I told the sister about the vision and she said that the description of the dress exactly answered to her mother's, and that they had brass candlesticks at home exactly like the one described. There was not the slightest resemblance between mother and daughter.[3]

"FRANCES REDDELL."

Is it possible to explain this by saying that the dying girl was naturally thinking of her mother, and perhaps would picture her mother as she would have looked under such circumstances, and that this picture was so vivid as to be transmitted from her mind to the brain of the maid who was attending her? What about the bell ringing?

Mr. Podmore's criticism upon an instance similar to the two foregoing is as follows:

"Collective percipience forms one of the most interesting problems presented by this inquiry. *It need hardly be said that we do not regard it as any evidence that the thing seen is objective in any sense.* [Italics are mine.] If we may infer . . . that the vision was not merely an illusion, and was not suggested by one percipient to the other verbally, we have here two alternative hypotheses: (1) That each percipient is affected independently by a distant mind; or (2) that the hallucination originating telepathically or otherwise in one percipient is transferred telepathically to his co-percipient. The first explanation seems the simplest and most probable when the two percipients are a considerable distance apart. But instances of this kind, as already said, are rare. The second explanation is that which is to be preferred in most cases, for several reasons, of which the chief is that the impressions of the two percipients when in the same locality are, as said, nearly always similar; whereas if independently originated we should expect them to be frequently dissimilar."[4]

Can we feel that this is satisfactory or adequate?

LEVITATION.

Again, let us take the instances of what is called "Levitation," which has undoubtedly occurred in the case of many "mediums,"

[3] *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 259.

[4] *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 265.

and which was especially noteworthy in the case of Daniel Home. And here again let us premise that we abstract altogether from fraud, though of this more anon. We will give at length one account of the levitation of Mr. Home, because it is so remarkable and because it includes all other cases:

"Amongst the most remarkable evidence was that tendered (to the second sub-committee) by the Master of Lindsay, now the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, F.R.S. He testified to having seen Home float about the room. . . . Two years later (1871) he thus describes in detail an instance of levitation to which he had referred in his evidence before the Committee:

"I was sitting with Mr. Home and Lord Adare and a cousin of his. During the sitting Mr. Home went into a trance, and in that state was carried out of the window in the room next to where we were, and was brought in at our window. The distance between the two windows was about seven feet six inches, and there was not the slightest foothold between them, nor was there more than a twelve-inch projection to each window, which served as a ledge to put flowers on. We heard the window in the next room lifted up, and, almost immediately after, we saw Home floating in the air outside our window. The moon was shining full into the room; my back was to the light, and I saw the shadow on the wall of the window's sill, and Home's feet six inches above it. He remained in this position for several seconds, then raised the window and glided into the room feet foremost and sat down.

"Lord Adare then went into the next room to look at the window from which he had been carried. It was raised about eighteen inches, and he expressed his wonder how Mr. Home had been taken through so narrow an aperture. Home said, still entranced, 'I will show you'; and then with his back to the window he leaned back and was shot out of the aperture, head first, with the body rigid, and then returned quite quietly. The window is about seventy feet from the ground.

"It should be added that Lord Adare and the cousin referred to, Captain C. Wynne, have given independent corroboration of Lord Lindsay's account of this incident."[5]

Mr. Podmore's comment on this is: "It is difficult to suppose

[5] *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 52; and *Journal S. P. R.*, August, 1880, p. 108.

that the most imbecile laxness of observation, or the most fatuous disregard of elementary precautions, would account for . . . the elongation and levitation of Mr. Home, as witnessed in a lighted room at close quarters by the Master of Lindsay and Lord Adare. I could find myself unable to conceive that simple trickery could, under the circumstances described, be adequate to the effects reported. Short of admitting the phenomena as genuine, I can suggest but one plausible explanation—that the witnesses were to some extent hallucinated."[6] How this hallucination might have taken place he proceeds to suggest, but his suggestion is nugatory, and we suspect that if Mr. Podmore were questioned, he would himself frankly admit its insufficiency. All readers of Catholic hagiography are acquainted with the strange ecstatic "flights" of St. Joseph of Cupertino. If the levitations or "flights" of Mr. Home are to be explained as hallucinations on the part of the witnesses, why not also so explain those of St. Joseph of Cupertino? Yet with him it was a frequent occurrence, witnessed by many different persons.

Preternatural Sounds.

Let us take now the strange and presumably preternatural sounds that are frequent accompaniments of spiritualistic meetings. The spirit is supposed to communicate by raps on the table or on the walls, and often manifests its presence and its wish to be communicative by means of such rappings. This was particularly the case in the early days of spirit manifestations, when loud knocks and other startling noises were heard, particularly in the neighborhood of two little girls in the Fox family. These were explained by Professors Flint, Lee, and Coventry, of Buffalo, as produced by rapidly partially dislocating and restoring the knee and other joints. But will such an explanation as this, however possible in an individual case, cover the moving of furniture, the musical sounds, the quasi-human voices, the ringing of bells, and other similar phenomena which are abundantly attested?

Those who reject the preternatural in all such spiritualistic manifestations are bound to have recourse to fraud or hallucination or some psychical processes, the nature of which we can only

[6] *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 120.

partially guess. But the truth would seem to be that, though all these causes may be and very probably are at work, yet no one of them, nor all of them collectively, can be taken as adequately covering all the phenomena.

The Catholic View.

To the Catholic theologian the answer is easy, and an amply adequate cause for all these phenomena may with confidence be assigned. There is a spirit-world, as the Scripture teaches and as Holy Church has defined. And this spirit-world is divided into two hosts, which are marshalled respectively under the banners of good or of evil—the angels of God who stood firm in the conflict, Satan and his host who rebelled. These latter are mighty intelligences, even though fallen; they are the instruments of God, who works His will and carries out the government of the universe through His good angels, in His all-wise Providence permitting the powers of evil to strive for the mastery with Him over the souls of men: "For God created man incorruptible, and to the image of His own likeness He made him. But by the envy of the devil, death came into the world: and they follow him that are of his side."[7] We know, too, that our Saviour Himself suffered the devil to tempt Him, in consequence of which St. Paul says: "Put ye on the armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the deceits of the devil, for our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirit of wickedness in the high places."[8] And that these angels appear to men and walk and talk with them, not merely in the imaginations of those who fancy they behold them but also as objective realities, is proved by St. Thomas in an argument which may be applied again and again to show the insufficiency of the explanation of spiritualistic apparitions by mere thought-transference. "There are some," he says, "who declare that the angels never assume bodies, and that all that we read in the Bible about apparitions of angels took place in prophetic vision, that is, were merely in the imagination of the beholder. But this view is opposed to the evident sense of the Scriptures. For what is

[7] Wisdom 2: 23–25.

[8] Ephes. 6: 11, 12.

seen by an imaginary apparition is only in the imagination of him who sees it, and *hence is not seen by everybody indiscriminately*. But the Bible sometimes tells us of angels so appearing as to be seen by all alike; thus the angels who appeared to Abraham were seen by him, and by his whole household, and by Lot and by the inhabitants of Sodom. Similarly the angel who appeared to Tobias was seen by all. From this it is clear that these apparitions took place by a corporal presence by which we see something which is outside of us, *and which can be therefore seen by everybody*."[9]

He then proposes the difficulty that these bodies thus assumed by the angels cannot be formed of earth or water, else they would not disappear instantaneously; nor of fire, for it would burn those who came near; nor of air, which has no shape or color. He suggests in answer that probably these bodies are formed of air which, when condensed, is capable of being moulded into shape and also of receiving color, as is clear from the case of the clouds.[10]

We may argue, then, that illusion will explain many so-called apparitions; that thought-transference and telepathy will explain certain others, and that fraud undoubtedly plays an important part in many *séances*. Nevertheless none of these causes is adequate to explain persistent phenomena visible to many at once. If we once grant the existence of a body of evil spirits, whose malignity St. Peter so well sums up in his well-known words: "Be sober and watch: because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour;"[11] and if we recollect the craving of the human mind for contact with the world beyond the veil, a craving which insists on being satisfied whether by true or false religion, it is easy to go a step farther and allow the possibility, nay, the probability, that when man unduly craves such knowledge, the evil spirit will be only too willing to help him. For he has marvellous power over the elements and the forces of nature, and why should he not use them for the seduction of foolish man, as he did of old in

[9] *1a pars* L. 1, 2.

[10] By "air" St. Thomas, of course, means any vapor; by "water" he understands this element in its liquid state.

[11] I Peter 5: 8.

Pharaoh's court? Strange sounds are nothing to him; to bring hot-house plants and tropical shrubs suddenly into the room, regardless of the season of the year, is child's play to him; to raise up men's bodies, more especially when they wish for it, is an easy matter for him. How does he do it? We know not; we can only conjecture. He may use those forces of nature at whose existence we have only recently begun to guess, and of which wireless telegraphy has afforded us such an astounding revelation; he may use telepathy and thought-transference; he may know the secrets of brain-waves, as psychicists call them; the undulations of the ether and the sensitiveness of the brain-cells to various impressions may be no mystery to him. Why should he not use them? The fact remains that *we* cannot use them at beck and call. We do not know their secrets and the mode of employing them for our own ends. What spiritualistic medium has ever had a profound knowledge of chemistry, still less of psychic science? Can it be that they are *naturally* far in advance of our leading philosophers and students of mental science? And so much in advance of them as to be able to do at will what the most electrically-constituted natures have only rarely succeeded in accomplishing at the cost of much labor and effort?

Predictions.

But what about the predictions of the future which are sometimes so marked a feature of these *séances*. A poor woman told the writer a short time ago that she had gone somewhat unwillingly to a *séance*, where one of her neighbors had worked upon her curiosity, and she had at last consented to see what it was like. Imagine her amazement when in the middle of the proceedings the medium suddenly turned to her and said, "Your daughter is up to her neck in water!" On returning home she found that her daughter's dead body had just been brought in; she had fallen into a deep pool when trying to cross the common in the twilight.

Again, take the following instance from the Proceedings of the S. P. R., as quoted in *Studies in Psychical Research*, p. 348:

"The following case was communicated to me by a lady of my acquaintance, whose accuracy in ordinary matters can be relied on.

She was introduced some years since by William Lloyd Garrison to a clairvoyante medium in Boston, U. S. A.:

"*II. From Mrs. P.*

"Though I had only arrived in Boston the day before, her guides instantly recognized that I had come over the water, and opened up not only my past life, but a great deal of the future. They said I had a picture of my family with me, and on producing it the medium told me (in trance) that two of my children were in the spirit world, and, pointing to one son in the group, she said, 'You will soon have this one there; he will die suddenly, but you must not weep for him; he will be taken from the evil to come. It is not often permitted to tell these things, but we see it is best for you, that you may know it is no accident.'

"I had not been home many weeks before my son, a brave boy of seventeen, was killed at a game of football."

PSEUDO-PROPHECY.

We have two instances of knowledge which could not be obtained by human means. Putting fraud aside, and it is difficult to see how it could be of assistance in the above cases, and supposing the truth of the two stories, it follows that this knowledge was either preternaturally or supernaturally obtained,—supernaturally, if no created mind could know it; preternaturally, if, though beyond the scope of the human mind, and thus unusual, it lay within the ken of *some* created intelligence. St. Thomas' doctrine of God's foreknowledge of mere contingencies will help us here. We must premise that "with the Father of Lights . . . there is no change or shadow of vicissitude;"[12] with Him there is no past, present, or future; His measure is eternity, which has been well defined as *nunc stans*—not time, which has been equally well defined as *nunc fluens*. His eternal decree has arranged all the temporal succession of events which follow one another in an orderly procession or sequence in time, but not with regard to Him, who sees them all in the one calm gaze of eternity. For the production, however, of this orderly sequence of temporal changes He has prepared a vast series of causes, each bringing about their due effects in different ways. He sees what

[12] St. James 1 : 17.

to us is future, in itself as actually present to the gaze of His eternity, quite irrespective of the created causes which He has arranged for its production in time; not so we finite beings who must needs gauge all things by time and must see them in their successive order. Still, when these duly ordered causes are near producing their effects, we can by an inspection of those causes, very frequently divine with tolerable certainty what those effects will be; and the clearer our intellect, the more unclouded our mind, the more searching will be this gaze into created causes and this divination of their future effects. And St. Thomas thus applies this doctrine in his discussion upon the distinction between true and false prophecy: "But evil spirits, striving to destroy the truths of faith, just as they make an ill-use of miracles so as to teach men falsehood and so as to weaken the arguments for the true faith, and yet do not work real miracles, but rather produce effects which seem to men miraculous, as we have shown above; so also do these evil spirits abuse prophetic declaration, not indeed by truly prophesying, but by foretelling certain things according to the ordering of certain causes hidden from us men, so that they may appear to foreknow the said things in themselves; and though these contingent effects arise from natural causes, nevertheless the aforesaid spirits by the depth of their understandings can know more than men can, for they know when and how natural causes can be hindered from producing their effects; and hence when they foretell the future, they appear more marvellous and more truthful than the most learned men." [13]

Thus in the case mentioned above of the poor woman whose daughter was drowned, the spirit at work may have actually seen the event which was presumably taking place at the moment; while, in the second instance, a knowledge of the working of a certain series of causes would lead him to the conjectural knowledge of the lad's death, a conjecture which after events prove to have been well-founded. Here it should be remarked that we only hear of those cases where the conjecture has been verified: no record is kept of those cases where events have falsified even the most sagacious interpretation of the probable course of events.

[13] *Contra Gentiles*, lib. III, cap. cliv.

The adequacy of such an explanation of the marvels witnessed at *séances* cannot be doubted. It will only be unsatisfactory to those who doubt the doctrine of the existence of the spirit-world and of their very intimate relations with us. It should be noticed, moreover, that it alone of any theory explains the undoubted fact that many "mediums" who have performed prodigies which no conjuring or sleight-of-hand will explain, have yet been detected in fraudulent attempts to deceive. Prophecy was not an habitual gift any more than the power of working miracles; that is to say, they were gifts which could not be employed at will, but only according as God who bestowed them, designed at particular times to use His prophets or His saints as the vehicles of His revelation or of His interference with the ordinary course of nature. So, too, when a man allows himself to be the instrument of the powers of evil, he has not these evil spirits at his beck and call, nor are they in their influence over him irresponsible agents. They are *permitted* to do evil; no more. Consequently their action is intermittent, and so also is the acquired spiritualistic power of the medium. Hence, though often able to perform marvellous feats, the medium is not always able to do so at will, and is thus induced, for fear of losing credit, to supplement his occasional powers by *leger-de-main* or conjuring.

Is this a true estimate of spiritualism? It is certainly a reasonable one, and as an attempt to assign an *adequate* cause to a large or recurrent series of phenomena it is certainly more satisfactory than any other. And yet in what an absolute condemnation of the practice it necessarily results!

HUGH POPE, O.P.

Hawkesyard Priory, England.

Analecta.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

Dubia circa Missam de Requie.

R. D. Josephus Erker canonicus cathedralis Ecclesiae Labacensis, de consensu Rmi sui Episcopi, a Sacra Rituum Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutionem humillime flagitavit; nimirum:

I. Privilegium circa Missas de Requie concessum sacellis sepulcreti ex Decreto n. 3903, diei 8 Iunii 1896, et ecclesiae vel oratorio publico ac principali ipsius sepulcreti ex Decreto n. 3944, diei 12 Ian. 1897 ad I^{um}, favetne etiam sacellis, ecclesiis et oratoriis publicis sepulcreti, in quo olim cadavera sepeliebantur, quod sepulcretum tamen hodie quacunque ex causa derelictum est, ita ut defuncti in eo non amplius sepeliri soleant?

II. Praefatum privilegium favetne etiam ecclesiae parochiali, quae circumjacens habet coemeterium, quum in casu ecclesia parochialis revera evaserit ecclesia sepulcreti?

III. In anniversariis stricte sumptis laicorum, quae fundata sunt extra diem vere anniversariam ab obitu vel depositione, potestne sumi Oratio *Deus indulgentiarum Domine?*

IV. Anniversaria late sumpta, quae ex Decreto generali n. 3753 diei 2 Dec. 1891 pro fidelium pietate infra octavum Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum locum habent, suntne adeo praecise adstricta ad dictam octavam, ut aliis temporibus e. g. infra octavam Dedicationis ecclesiae vel Titularis ejusdem vel in uno ex Quatuor Temporibus non permittantur?

V. In ecclesiis ad chorum non obligatis plures Missas habentibus, in die Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum debetne esse una saltem Missa cum cantu de Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, an omnes possunt esse lectae?

VI. Quaenam Missa de Requie sumenda est in ecclesiis unam tantum Missam habentibus, quando in die Commemorationis Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum occurrit alicuius defuncti dies depositionis?

VII. Ex Decreto n. 3944 diei 12 Ian. 1877 ad 3, et 3 Apr. 1900 ad 3 et 4 in una *Vicen.* Missae privatae die vel pro die obitus seu depositionis in ecclesiis et oratoriis publicis fieri permittuntur, si in iisdem etiam fiat funus cum Missa exequiali cum cantu, servatis servandis. Quaeritur: An funus cum Missa exequiali in cantu fieri debeat etiam in oratoriis *semipublicis*, ut fieri inibi possint praefatae Missae lectae de Requie?

VIII. Iuxta praefatum Decretum diei 3 Apr. ad 3 et 4 in una *Vicen.* in oratoriis privatis Missae, quae ibidem legi permittuntur, possunt esse de Requie *praesente cadavere in domo.* Quaeritur: Utrum haec praesentia intelligenda sit de praesentia non solum physica sed etiam morali in *domo*, quatenus ex gravi causa ex. gr. ob contagiosum morbum cadaver vetatur haberi in *domo?*

IX. Ex Decreto generali n. 3755 diei 2 Dec. 1891 Missam exequialem solemnem impediunt Festa duplicia I. classis solemniora, sive universalis Ecclesiae sive Ecclesiarum, *ex praecepto Rubricarum recolenda.* Quaeritur: Utrum haec ultima verba intelligenda sint tantum de Festis fori recolendis cum feriatione ex parte fidelium vel etiam de Festis chori sine feriatione, qualia sunt e. g. anniversarium Dedicationis propriae ecclesiae, Festum patroni regionis, dioecesis aut loci, quae non ubique recoluntur a populo?

X. Quaeritur: Utrum Missa de Requie cum cantu, quae ex praefato Decreto generali n. 3755 ad III, "celebrari potest pro

prima tantum vice post obitum vel ejus acceptum a locis dissitis nuntium die, quae prima occurrat non impedita a Festo 1 et 2 classis vel Festo de praecepto" cantari possit Feria IV Cinerum, Vigiliis Nativitatis Domini et Pentecostes, Feria IV, V, VI et Sabbato infra octavas Paschatis et Pentecostes, quum licet hae dies neque Festa sint de praecepto neque ritum 1 vel 2 classis habeant, excludunt tamen eadem Duplicia 1 classis?

XI. Quaeritur: 1. An in Missis de Requie, quae, abstrahendo a Missa exequiali solemni aliisque occasione huius lectis, in *Semiduplicibus et Simplicibus* occurrentibus ab obitu usque ad depositionem alicuius fiunt cum vel sine cantu, adhibendum sit idem formulare ac in die obitus seu depositionis? 2. An idem dicendum sit etiam respectu Missarum, quae celebrantur in biduo post factam ob gravem causam sepulturam, si occurrat Semiduplex vel Simplex?

XII. In Decreto n. 3822 diei 3 Apr. 1894 disponitur, "ut dum corpus Episcopi dioecesani defuncti, sacris indutum vestibus, in propriae aedis aula majori publice et solemniter jacet expositum, Missae in suffragium animae ejus per totum mane celebrari valeant, iis omnibus servatis etc." Quaeritur: An haec dispositio necessario intelligi debeat de *Missis de Requie* pro defuncto Episcopo dioecesano inibi celebrandis, idque nullo habito respectu ritus aut solemnitatis diei, qua celebrantur, sive sit Duplex majus aut minus, sive classicum vel Festum solemne?

XIII. Expositio Sanctissimi Sacramenti publica seu solemnis, quae fit de licentia Ordinarii potestne fieri etiam cum pyxide collocanda in throno tabernaculi?

XIV. Expositio Sanctissimi Sacramenti privata, et minus solemnis, quae fit cum pyxide intra tabernaculum, ostiolo patefacto, si sit permanens et ex causa publica, impeditne Missas de Requie?

XV. Sacerdos obligatus sive ex fundatione sive ex stipendio accepto ad celebrandam Missam pro uno vel pluribus defunctis, satisfacitne suae obligationi, applicando pro iisdem defunctis Missam officio diei conformem in Semiduplicibus aliisque diebus Missas quotidianas de Requie permittentibus, vel tenetur dictis diebus celebrare Missam de Requie, etiamsi fundator vel dans eleemosynam, Missam de Requie expresse non postulaverit, nec Missa celebranda sit in altari privilegiato?

Sacra porro Rituum, Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisita sententia Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque accurate perpensis rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. *Negative.*

Ad II. *Negative.*

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Ad IV. *Affirmative.*

Ad V. Missam in cantu de Commem. Omn. fid. defunct. in casu, non esse praescriptam.

Ad VI. Missa erit ut in die obitus.

Ad VII. Negative in casu.

Ad VIII. Affirmative, iuxta Decretum 3903 diei 8. Junii 1896.

Ad IX. Negative ad primam partem; Affirmative ad secundam, quoad festa localia solemniora.

Ad X. Negative in omnibus, iuxta Decr. Gen. n. 3922 diei 30 Iunii 1896, § III, n. 2.

Ad XI. Ad 1^{um} et 2^{um}, adhibeatur Missa ut in die obitus, seu depositionis.

Ad XII. Missae lectae, in casu, permittuntur ad normam Decreti n. 3903, diei 8 Junii 1896.

Ad XIII. Negative iuxta Decreta.

XIV. Affirmative, in casu, iuxta Decretum n. 2390 *Varsavien.* 7 Maii 1746 ad 4.

Ad XV. Detur Decretum n. 4031 *Plurium Dioecesium* 13 Junii 1899, ad IV.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 28 Aprilis 1902.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

L. ✝ S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodic., Secret.*

II.

DECRETUM DIEI 9 MAII 1897 DE NOVENDIALI SUPPLICATIONE IN HONOREM SPIRITUS SANCTI PRO SINGULIS ANNIS.

Reverendissime Domine:

Ad fovendum in christiano populo pietatis studium erga divi-

num Spiritum, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo PP. XIII die IX Maii an. MDCCCLXXXXVII ad universos episcopos, uti nosti, Litteras dedit encyclicas *Divinum illud munus*, apostolicae caritatis sapientiaeque plenas.

Plura in ipsis Beatissimus Pater de mysterio Trinitatis augustae, ac praesertim de praesentia et virtute mirifica Spiritus Sancti opportune edocuit: tum omnes e clero, nominatimque concionatores sacros, animarumque curatores maiorem in modum hortatus est, ut quae ad Spiritum Sanctum pertinent, diligentius atque uberius christiano populo traderent. Quo magis enim excitetur vigeatque in animis de Ipso fides, eo facilius christiani homines assuescent divinum Paraclitum, *altissimi donum Dei*, et amare ardentius et impensius implorare.—Adventantibus insuper sacrae Pentecostes sollemnibus, Summus ipse Pontifex per easdem litteras decrevit et mandavit ut per orbem catholicum universum, supplicatio novendialis in omnibus curialibus templis, et si Ordinariis locorum utile videretur, in aliis etiam templis sacrariisve fieret. Plura demum de thesauro Ecclesiae benigne in perpetuum largitus est sacrae indulgentiae munera, etiam per octavam Solemnitatis a fidelibus lucranda.

Iamvero Sanctitas Sua vehementer exoptat ut quae tunc, monendo hortandoque, edixit, ea in omnium animis, diligenti Cleri opera, et viva insideant, et perennes uberesque, ad maiorem divini Spiritus gloriam afferant salutariter fructus. Hanc ipsam ob causam exemplar earumdem Litterarum, iussu eiusdem Beatissimi Patris, ad Te una mitto.—Quoniam vero decursu temporis, ut alicubi accidisse constat, a nonnullis existimatum est, decretum de ea novendiali supplicatione, ad supra dictum tantummodo annum MDCCCLXXXXVII spectasse, magni refert ut sit apprime cognitum, quae in memoratis litteris sunt praescripta, tum de eadem supplicatione tum de sacrae indulgentiae muneribus, pro singulis in perpetuum annis sancita fuisse.—Quam quidem novendialem supplicationem eo magis Summus Pontifex vult omnibus enixe commendatam, quod ad finem sane praestantissimum, scilicet *ad maturandum christianae unitatis bonum*, de quo tantopere sollicita est Sanctitas Sua, eam ipsam praecipue ordinaverit.

Haec habui quae mandato augusti Pontificis Amplitudini Tuae perscriberem. Ipsa vero Sanctitas Sua spem certam fovet Epis-

coporum hac etiam in re navitati et industriae alacritatem Cleri, Deo bene iuvante, responsuram.

Interim A. T. fausta cuncta ex animo adprecor.

Romae, ex Secret. SS. Rit. Congr. die 18 Aprilis 1902.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *S.R.C. Praef.*

L. † S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodic., Secret.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

CONCEDUNTUR INDULG. RECITANTIBUS NOVAM CORONAM SPIRITUS SANCTI.

LEO PP. XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Cum dilectus filius Noster Iosephus Calasanctius S. R. E. Diaconus Cardinalis Vives y Tuto, nomine etiam hodierni Praepositi Generalis Ordinis Minorum Capulatorum atque universi Ordinis ipsius, enixas Nobis preces humiliter adhibuerit, ut fidelibus pie recitantibus Coronam Spiritus Sancti a SS. Rituum Congregatione approbatam, nonnullas indulgentias largiri de N.ra benignitate velimus: Nos ut tam frugifera exercitatio uberiori cum animarum fructu fiat, atque erga Paraclitum, plebis christianae obsequium amplificetur, votis huiusmodi annuendum existimavimus. Quare de Omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Ap.lorum eius auctoritate confisi, omnibus ac singulis utriusque sexus christifidelibus ubique terrarum existentibus pie ac saltem contrito corde quovis anni die recitantibus privatim sive publice dictam Coronam Spiritus Sancti quocumque idiomate, dummodo versio fidelis sit iuxta exemplar quod lingua latina exaratum in tabulario Secretariae Nostrae Brevium asservari iussimus, in forma Ecclesiae solita de poenalium numero septem annos totidemque quadragenas expungimus. Iis vero qui dictam Coronam habitualiter recitent ac die festo Pentecostes vel uno ad cuiusque libitum eligendo intra eiusdem festi octiduum die admissorum confessione expiati ac coelestibus epulis refecti quamlibet Ecclesiam vel publicum oratorium ubique terrarum situm visitent ibique pro Christianorum Principum concordia,

haeresum extirpatione, peccatorum conversione ac S. Matris Ecclesiae exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effundant, Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in D.no concedimus. Tandem largimur fidelibus ipsis liceat si malint plenaria ac partialibus hisce indulgentiis vita functorum labes paenasque expiare. Non obstantibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris. Volumus autem ut praesentium litterarum authenticum exemplar transmittatur ad Secretariam Cong.nis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, atque earumdem litterarum transumptis seu exemplis etiam impressis manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis, et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae praemunitis, eadem prorsus adhibeatur fides quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae. Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XXIV Martii MCMII, Pontificatus Nostri Anno Vigesimoquinto.

L. † S. ALOIS. *Card.* MACCHI.

Praesentium litterarum authenticum exemplar transmissum fuit ad hanc Secretariam S. Congr. Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae. In quorum fidem etc.

Datum Romae ex eadem Se.cria die 8 Aprilis 1902.

L. † S. FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden., Secret.*

CORONA SPIRITUS SANCTI.

In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Brevis Actus Contritionis.

Doleo, mi Deus, me contra te peccasse, quia tam bonus es; gratia Tua adiuvante non amplius peccabo.

HYMNUS.

Veni, Creator Spiritus,
Mentes tuorum visita,
Imple superna gratia,
Quae tu creasti pectora.

Qui diceris Paraclitus,
Altissimi donum Dei,
Fons vivus, ignis, charitas,
Et spiritalis unctio.

Tu septiformis munĕre,
Digitus Paternae dexterae,
Tu rite promissum Patris,
Sermone ditans guttura.

Accende lumen sensibus,
Infunde amorem cordibus,
Infirma nostri corporis
Virtute firmans perpeti.

Hostem repellas longius,
Pacemque dones protinus:
Ductore sit te praevio,
Vitemus omne noxium.

Per te sciamus da Patrem,
Noscamus atque Filium:
Teque utriusque Spiritum
Credamus omni tempore.

Deo Patri sit gloria,
Et Filio, qui a mortuis
Surrexit, ac Paraclito
In saeculorum saecula. Amen.

V. Emitte Spiritum tuum et creabuntur.
R. Et renovabis faciem terrae.

OREMUS.

Deus, qui corda fidelium Sancti Spiritus illustratione docuisti: da nobis in eodem Spiritu recta sapere; et de eius semper consolatione gaudere. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

I.—Mysterium primum.

De Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virgine Iesus conceptus est.

Meditatio.—"Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus Altissimi obumbrabit tibi. Ideoque et quod nascetur ex te Sanctum, vocabitur Filius Dei." (Luc. 1: 35.)

Exercitatio.—Precare vehementer Divini Spiritus auxilium et

Mariae intercessionem ad imitandas virtutes Iesu Christi, qui est exemplar virtutem, ut conformis fias imagini Filii Dei.

Semel *Pater* et *Ave* et septies *Gloria Patri*, etc.

II.—Mysterium secundum.

Spiritus Domini requievit super Iesum.

Meditatio.—"Baptizatus autem Iesus, confestim ascendit de aqua, et ecce aperti sunt ei coeli: et vidit Spiritum Dei descendentem sicut columbam, et venientem super se." (Matth. 3: 16.)

Exercitatio.—In summo pretio habe inaestimabilem gratiam sanctificantem per Spiritum Sanctum in Baptismo cordi tuo infusam. Tene promissa, ad quae servanda tunc te obstrinxisti. Continua exercitatione auge fidem, spem, charitatem. Semper vive ut decet filios Dei et verae Dei Ecclesiae membra, ut post hanc vitam accipias coeli haereditatem.

Semel *Pater* et *Ave* et septies *Gloria Patri*, etc.

III.—Mysterium tertium.

A Spiritu ductus est Iesus in desertum.

Meditatio.—"Iesus autem plenus Spiritu Sancto regressus est a Iordane: et agebatur a Spiritu in desertum diebus quadraginta, et tentabatur a Diabolo." (Luc. 4: 1, 2.)

Exercitatio.—Semper esto gratus pro septiformi munere Spiritus Sancti in Confirmatione tibi dato, pro Spiritu sapientiae et intellectus, consilii et fortitudinis, scientiae et pietatis, timoris Domini. Fideliter obsequere Divino Duci ut in omnibus periculis huius vitae et tentationibus viriliter agas, sicut decet perfectum Christianum et fortem Iesu Christi athletam.

Semel *Pater* et *Ave* et septies *Gloria Patri*, etc.

IV.—Mysterium quartum.

Spiritus Sanctus in Ecclesia.

Meditatio.—"Factus est repente de coelo sonus tamquam advenientis spiritus vehementis; ubi erant sedentes: et repleti sunt omnes Spiritu Sancto loquentes magnalia Dei." (Act. 2: 2, 4, 11.)

Exercitatio.—Gratias age Deo quod te fecit Ecclesiae suae filium, quam Divinus Spiritus Pentecostes die in mundum missus semper vivificat et regit. Audi et sequere Summum Pontificem, qui per Spiritum Sanctum infallibiliter docet, atque Ecclesiam quae est columna et firmamentum veritatis. Dogmata eius tuere, eius partes tene, eius iura defende.

Semel *Pater* et *Ave* et septies *Gloria Patri*, etc.

V.—MYSTERIUM QUINTUM.

Spiritus Sanctus in anima Iusti.

Meditatio.—"An nescitis quoniam membra vestra templum sunt Spiritus Sancti qui in vobis est?" (I Cor. 6: 19.)

"Spiritum nolite extinguere." (I Thess. 5: 19.)

"Et nolite contristare Spiritum Sanctum Dei in quo signati estis in diem redemptionis." (Eph. 4: 30.)

Exercitatio.—Semper recordare de Spiritu Sancto qui est in te, et puritati animae et corporis omnem da operam. Fideliter obedi divinis eius inspirationibus, ut facias fructus Spiritus; charitatem, gaudium, pacem, benignitatem, bonitatem, longanimitatem, mansuetudinem, fidem, modestiam, continentiam, castitatem.

Semel *Pater* et *Ave* et septies *Gloria Patri*, etc.

In fine dicas Symb. Ap. *Credo in Deum* ut professionem fidei, et *Pater*, *Ave*, *Gloria* semel ad intentionem Summi Pontificis.

Concordat cum suo Originali.

In quorum fidem etc.

Ex Secretaria Sacror. Rituum Congregationis, die 19 Aprilis 1902.

L. † S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., S.R.C. Secret.*

II.

INDULG. 50 DIERUM CONCEDITUR TOTIES QUOTIES RECITANTIBUS VERS.: "REQUIEM AETERNAM DONA EIS, DOMINE, ET LUX PERPETUA LUCEAT EIS."

LEO PAPA XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Oblatis Nobis precibus annuentes a dilecto filio Paulo Buguet praeposito generali Piacularis

Operis pro animabus derelictis loci "Montligeon" dioecesis Sagien., omnibus et singulis fidelibus ex utroque sexu ubique terrarum degentibus, contrito saltem corde, ac devote qualibet vice recitantibus versiculum cum responsorio "*Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine, et lux perpetua luceat eis*" in forma Ecclesiae solita quinquaginta dierum indulgentiam concedimus, qua tantum liceat functorum vita labes poenasque. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris. Praecipimus autem, ut praesentium litterarum (quod nisi fiat, nullas easdem esse volumus) exemplar ad Secretariam Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae deferatur, iuxta Decretum ab eadem Congregatione sub die xix Ianuarii MDCCLVI latum et a s. m. Benedicto PP. XIV Praedecessore Nostro die XXVIII dicti mensis adprobatum, atque volumus, ut earumdem praesentium transumptis seu exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus habeatur fides, quae haberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XXII Martii MDCCCCII Pontificatus Nostri Anno Vigesimo quinto.

Pro D.no *Card.* MACCHI.

L. † S. NICOLAUS MARINI, *Subst.*

Praesentium litterarum exemplar delatum fuit ad hanc Secretariam S. C. Indulg. Sacrisque Reliq. praepositae. In quorum fidem, etc.

Datum Romae ex eadem Sec.ria die 26 Martii 1902.

FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden., Secret.*

L. † S.

Conferences.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—THE SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES:

1. *a.* Decides that the decree of 1896, June 8 (should read May 19), permitting private Requiem Masses on occasion of funerals to be said in mortuary chapels or oratories (in presence, actually or morally, of the dead body) on all days except doubles of the first class, holidays of obligation, and such ferials as exclude doubles of the first class, can not be applied to old mortuary chapels, no longer used for that purpose.

b. That the privilege does not apply to parish churches by reason merely of their having an adjacent cemetery. In all churches and public chapels the entire funeral service (besides the low Mass) must be conducted in the presence of the body in order to admit the use of the above privilege.[1] When there are grave reasons for immediate burial or for keeping the body of the dead in a secluded place, it is considered morally present.

c. Anniversaries are to be taken in the strict liturgical sense, that is to say, that they may not be anticipated or deferred at discretion.

d. A funeral Mass said for a person on the day of burial occurring on All Souls' Day is the ordinary Mass *in die obitus*.

[1] *Cf.* Decree, April 3, 1900.

In regard to the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament the Sacred Congregation—

2. *a.* Decides that it is not permitted to expose the ciborium on the throne in place of the monstrance for the purpose of public adoration.

b. Requiem Masses are not to be celebrated at the altar of exposition, even if the exposition be only what is called private exposition of the ciborium, when the tabernacle is simply opened for continuous adoration, *ex publica causa*, or by command of the Ordinary.

3. States that the Pontifical Decree of May 9, 1897, prescribing a novena for the feast of Pentecost in parish churches and chapels approved by the Ordinary, is binding for all places and times in future. The Holy Father adds an injunction urging the Bishops to uphold the observance of the Decree.

II.—The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences:

1. Publishes a new form of reciting the Rosary of the Holy Ghost, together with the indulgences attached to the same.

2. Grants an Indulgence of *fifty days* for the devout repetition of the verse: *Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord; and let perpetual light shine upon them.* (For the Souls in Purgatory.)

A COMPLAINT FROM AUSTRALIA ABOUT CATHEDRATICUM.

Qu. Would The Ecclesiastical Review kindly express its opinion on a subject that has exercised the minds as well as the patience of a number of Australian priests of late. It is a case of Clergy *vs.* Bishop, and seems to involve a principle of justice. We have no court of appeal, such as you have in America, in the Office of Apostolic Delegate, and our Bishops are supreme masters, from whom we cannot dissent openly without fear of suspension. There are those among us who think the Bishops act within their right; others deny it and

believe that there is a mutual understanding which must be observed in equity.

The question is about the distribution of revenues, of which a very unequal share is taken by the Bishops, leaving many priests hardly able to manage. We are told that we tacitly agreed at ordination and by our "title" to accept any appointment and to comply with the existing diocesan regulations which are laid down by the Bishop.

Perhaps I should state that in Australia each diocese has its own diocesan regulations. The system of revenue distribution differs in different dioceses; but that which prevails at present in some of the dioceses of this country is as here given:

The Bishop retains the pastoral title of all the parishes or districts, and he appoints an administrator to attend to the parochial work. The administrator is either alone or has one or two assistants, according to the size of the parish. In all such parishes the Bishop receives half the revenue that remains after paying all the house expenses; the other half goes to the priest of the parish, if there be only one, but in case of two or three, the remaining half is divided between them. If, for example, a parish in which there are three priests has, after paying all the house expenses, an annual balance of £100, the Bishop gets £50, the administrator £25, and the remaining £25 are divided between the two assistants. Taking this parish as a model, in a tolerably large diocese of forty parishes—and there are dioceses that have seventy parishes in Australia—we find the annual income of the Bishop from this source alone equal to the combined income of all the priests of the diocese. The Bishop's annual income in this case is £2,000, each of his administrators has £25, and each of his assistants has £12 10s. a year.

In another diocese the statutes prescribe the following method, which occasionally develops very awkward results. The Bishop has three mensal parishes, in which ten priests are engaged. The income is disposed thus: After deducting all house expenses and a certain percentage to the chief administrators of the three parishes, the Bishop takes one-half, and the other half is divided between the ten priests. Besides this the Bishop receives from all country parishes a fourth of the Christmas and Easter dues. In parishes where the offertories and dues are large, this system allows the active priests a tolerably fair dividend; but in poor parishes where the offertories and dues are small, the dividend received by the assistant—who gets only half as much as the rector—is not enough to keep him decently clad. To

illustrate this method, let us say in a poor country parish, worked by two priests, the Christmas and Easter dues amount to £100. This sum must be drawn upon to the extent of £40, in order to supplement the regular revenue, and in order to defray the house expenses. But before it is touched, the Bishop's portion of one-fourth or £25 is to be set apart; the remaining £35 is divided between the rector and assistant, giving the rector less than £24, and the assistant less than £12 a year.

In some instances the assistant receives only £5, or even £3 for a half-year's dividend; and this at a time when the Bishop of the diocese is drawing a revenue from all sources of about £1500 a year.

1. This seems scarcely an equitable arrangement, and I should like to ask whether the practice is founded on any canonical law?

2. Is the diocesan statute that lays down this system of distribution binding on the conscience of the priest? Some argue that it is not.

3. Is the Bishop, who frames and manipulates this statute, entitled to claim his portion as a right in conscience? Have the priests no redress?

SACERDOS AUSTRALIENSIS.

Resp. We could hardly express an opinion as to the equity status of the income question in the particular Australian dioceses to which our correspondent refers, unless we had before us the synodal statutes which contain the full details of the legislation. Presumably, these *statuta dioecesana* have the approval of the Holy See, which implies that sufficiently clear reasons have been submitted to the Roman authorities to show that the missionary conditions in Australia warrant a distribution of revenues, which, from a partial point of view, might seem unjust. Even if the statutes of the individual dioceses have not been submitted for the express approval of Rome, it is probable that they conform to the Provincial Acts which received a unifying norm in the decrees of the First Plenary Council of Sydney, in 1885. The basis of all such legislation is laid down in two Briefs of Pius VII, 1823, and Leo XII, 1828, to which the II. Provincial Council held at Melbourne in 1869, under the presidency of the Metropolitan of Sydney, makes reference in its chapter *De Sustentatione Episcoporum et Cleri.* Besides this, even if our correspondent has reference to some of the more recently established dioceses, it is

quite certain that the Holy See has cognizance of the system which disposes of the revenues in the respective jurisdiction. One of the questions regularly proposed by Rome, before acceding to the erection of a new diocese, is: "Qui reditus vel praesentationes assignari possint episcopatui?" That question is among those contained in the *Instruction* of the Propaganda added to the official letter endorsing the Decrees of the Second Australian Provincial Synod addressed to Dr. Polding by Cardinal Barnabo, in 1872. In that letter the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda expresses the desire of the Holy See that as soon as possible the Australian Bishops shall convoke their clergy to discuss in Diocesan Synod the best method of providing a sufficient annual Cathedraticum for the Bishop. "Mens fuit hujus Sacri Concilii Episcopis suadendum esse, ut hac de re pertracteat in Dioecesanis Synodis, in quibus collatis inter se consiliis sacerdotes curam habentes animarum conveniant de certa pensione Ordinario quotannis tribuenda, quae ex portione redituum singularum ecclesiarum coalescat." It is evident from this injunction, if it has been acted upon—and we must suppose it has—that the parish clergy voting in Synod is really the originator of the system in use.

However that be, it is hardly a matter for discussion in a public organ, since the legitimate ways of synodal complaint are always open to the parish clergy, either through the officials who owe their status to pastoral election, or through individual representation, which, *if it observe* the laws of moderation and respect for authority, together with exact truth in the statement of conditions, is sure to get a hearing and due consideration at the Propaganda. And where the matter really involves a question of equity, any spokesman of the clergy duly representative may state the facts without fear of losing the protection of the authorities at Rome, even if the Ordinary were to show his displeasure in individual cases. If there are instances where priests having a good cause did not receive full apparent recognition of their claims, it will be found on close examination that the good cause was defended in an intemperate way, and that the claimant, who began by being in the right, had got himself into the wrong before the end of his plea, thus making it impossible to accord him that confidence which is required toward a subject who lodges complaint against his superiors in office.

ILLEGALITY OF THE ASSOCIATIONS LAW IN FRANCE.

Many of the non-Catholic organs of public opinion in England and on the European Continent have expressed criticism of the recent French Legislation which aims at the disbanding or the expulsion of the Religious Communities. One of the leading London journals, *The Speaker*, publishes this censure of the Decree of June 27 and of Mr. Combes' circular of July 15:

"Whatever may be," says the writer, Mr. J. Bardoux, "the judicial position of the Congregations which Mr. Combes orders to be dissolved, his injunctions are nevertheless contrary to law. In the first place, if he aims at the schools created before 1901 by Congregations who have asked for a general permission, he had no right to close them by a decree, on the ground that they have not solicited special authorizations; for it is important to remember that the real signification of the word establishment (which was subsequently interpreted to include such schools) was discovered at the time of the decision of the Council of State (of which notice was given to the public on January 25, 1902); therefore, owing to their position, *it was impossible for these establishments to conform to the Law*, the time prescribed for asking permission having expired (January 15, 1902) when the new interpretation appeared (ten days later). On the other hand, if the circular aims at establishments founded before the Law, and since their general authorization, by authorized Congregations, it is still more illegal. One cannot reproach them for not having had individual authorizations for these branch establishments, since before 1901 there was no compulsion to obtain them; and the Law of 1901 was so worded as to embrace only establishments which would be founded after that date, as the text clearly states: 'No congregation will be permitted to found any new establishments.'"

The object of this (Mr. Combes') circular, says the same journal, which was said to be rendered necessary by the attitude of Mr. Loubet, who was unwilling to sign the new decree of expulsion, is to close, within a week, about 2,500 "teaching, congregational establishments, which existed previous to the Law of July 1, and which have refrained from putting into definite shape the demand for permission to remain, within the prescribed period." It appears that the government measure was applied in a most arbitrary and illegal manner. The prefects were not furnished

with the exact list of the establishments opened without permission; and hence gave the order to dissolve schools that had demanded permission, such as the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul in Paris; they also dissolved congregations which had been secularized by the Pope (the Salesian Fathers, Marseilles), and ignored legal decrees emanating from preceding governments. They have, besides, penetrated without the smallest scruple into private property, to make strict searches and to affix the seals. Many courts recognized the illegality of this proceeding; and the police superintendents received the order from the Ministry to replace the seals. Now, Article 184 of the Penal Code punishes with imprisonment and civil disgrace any functionaries "who have gone into the domicile of a citizen against the will of the latter, except in cases where the law prescribes it." Article 115 stipulates that if the superior who has given the orders is a minister, he will be punished by banishment. If the circular was so badly applied, the fact is due doubtless to its complete and absolute illegality.[1]

WANTED, HONEST BUILDERS.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Is there any way of warning legally the Rev. Clergy against incompetent architects, dishonest builders, and unreliable workmen? Nearly every priest has had an experience painful and costly, from which he would like to save his brethren and the public in general. Some architects call on a prospective builder and offer their services. In a few days they present a sketch. Then you find they think they have been engaged and send you a bill for services.

There are builders who have done bad work, who have supplied bad material, who have provokingly delayed work, who have failed to pay sub-contractors and dealers, and who have thus brought liens upon Church property that caused no end of trouble. No estimate can be made of the sums that have been lost in this way.

Will some reader suggest a plan? Would it be safe, for example, to publish in the REVIEW a notice or an advertisement reading: "Mr. ——, architect, or builder, or electrician, has done work for me. Before employing him, it will be well for you to consult me?"

ONE WHO HAS BEEN BITTEN.

[1] Cf. *The Tablet* (London), August 6, 1902, p. 262.

THE QUESTION OF THE FRIARS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

After resolving several times to send you a protest against what seems to be the REVIEW's decision in respect to the Philippine Friar question, and as many times abandoning my resolve, I now find myself in the act of writing you about this matter. You will see, therefore, that my difference from your attitude is not the result of a judgment made on the wing; nor is my letter conceived in the spirit of mere opposition. Far otherwise, indeed; for, let me confess it, I have learnt to admire the REVIEW for what it is—the safe organ of the best Catholic churchmanship in the language, the faithful guardian of orthodoxy, the enemy of sham and abuse wherever found, the friend and coöperator of ecclesiastical scholarship. Nevertheless—or perhaps all the more for this very reason—I wish to protest, and protest most emphatically, against the policy you seem to advocate against the Spanish priests in the Philippine Islands. I say *the policy you seem to advocate.* Other readers with whom I have discussed this question would find no place for the qualifying verb in the clause. And I can only explain my disinclination to go the full length with them in their repudiation of your utterances in the affair of the Friars, by the reflection that any just judgment of the Conference in question should not be made in disregard of the hitherto wise leading of the REVIEW. This very consideration, however, makes me view the utterances referred to as all the more grievous.

What will our fair-minded Protestants say, not to speak of the bigoted ones, when they learn that the organ of the Catholic Clergy of the country, as far as they have one, urges that the Friars be driven from the Philippines? These Religious Orders, you say, are "ruins," so much "decayed material"; and the Catholic who attempts their defence is merely "white-washing." I could not believe my eyes when I first read over these words of yours. But there they are, and he who runs may read. *Litera scripta manet*—alas! The words cannot be blotted out. The opening words of your own Conference make an apt commentary on your own blunder, though a not very satisfying one; for, though it may go far in excuse of the Editor to say, *Et aliquando dormitat bonus Homerus,* that does not undo the harm resulting from the blunder.

Resp. The foregoing letter is one of several that have reached the Editor apropos of this much-impugned Conference. We give

it preference to the others, because it is a fair sample of the letters of such of our readers as misconstrued our words, and fastened on them a meaning as hateful as it is alien from their true purport.

We would commend a more careful perusal of the Conference to our good correspondent and to others who read into it a meaning that was not ours. Since, however, the question as to the advisability of the Friars' withdrawal, which may be one of policy without implying any odium, is forced upon us, we frankly state our view in a separate article of this number. This we believe to be the only just view and the one which Rome has advocated. As for the "ruins" which need to be cast out—moral ruins—there is no doubt that such are to be found in the Philippine Islands. We did not anywhere say that these ruins were the Friars. The idea of such a statement is too absurd to require even denial.

A TESTAMENTARY PROMISE.

Qu. A parishioner whom the pastor attends during a serious illness, makes a voluntary promise to donate a stained glass window to the church which is in course of building at the time. The priest informs the sick man that all the windows of the new edifice have already been donated by promises from other parishioners; but suggests that an altar for one of the side shrines would be gratefully received, as completing the appointments of the church. The patient inquires what the cost of the altar would be, and, on being told that five hundred dollars would cover the expenses of making and placing it, appears satisfied wih the proposal. Shortly after this, the pastor is called away from the town. On his return he finds that his beneficent parishioner has died, and has left the sum of five hundred dollars in cash, in care of the person who had nursed him, together with a verbal message that this sum was to be given to the priest to say Masses for the deceased man's repose. The pastor feels fully convinced that the five hundred dollars handed him represent the donation intended for the altar, and therefore asks the Editor of the REVIEW for an opinion as to whether he is to accept them as a personal stipend binding him to the five hundred Masses.

Resp. Assuming that the circumstances of the case have been

so stated as to omit no element which might distinctly show that the dying man wished to retract his intention of making a gift to the church, we should say that the priest is justified in interpreting the informal bequest of five hundred dollars as the fulfilment of that intention.

It may indeed be objected that the words of the nurse who acted as messenger convey another purpose, namely, that of offering the sum as stipends for Masses, and that the last expression of a bequest supersedes the previous promise. To this I should answer: The sick man in making the voluntary promise of a bequest to the church had contracted a quasi-obligation to keep that promise. His conversation with the pastor, whom he left under the impression that he would offer an altar in place of the window, stands as a stronger testimony of his actual intention than the message given to the nurse, even if the words of the latter had to be taken in their literal sense as the dying man's wish. But there is good reason to believe that the words "for Masses" in the mouth of the testator meant the same as if he had said "for the altar which I promised to the church," since he might take for granted that Masses would be said for him as a benefactor, on that altar. Moreover, as there is no special reason to suppose that the nurse knew anything of the promise made to the priest, we may assume that the sick man, reasonably believing that the priest would understand the message in the light of their previous conversation, did not think it necessary to be more explicit; hence he simply used the form "for Masses" as the easiest way of avoiding a lengthy explanation to one not particularly concerned in the matter.

Nor could it be consistently argued that the mere acquiescence of the sick man in the proposal of the priest was not a valid promise. That the sick man wished to benefit the church is evident from his first proposal to donate a window; the substitution of an altar must be considered a merely accidental circumstance, since it proved within the means of the intending benefactor, as the event actually showed. Hence his acquiescence in view of his previous disposition, especially under circumstances in which he was probably not able to make many words, must be considered as a sufficient manifestation of his intention to give the altar.

The amount he actually gave to the priest corresponded exactly to the sum required to comply with that promise, and may therefore be taken as the fulfilment of it.

THE PONTIFICAL JUBILEE OF POPE LEO XIII.

The International Committee in charge of the commemorative exercises in connection with the Pontifical Jubilee, under the presidency of His Eminence Cardinal Respighi, Vicar of His Holiness, has requested us to call to the notice of our readers, and to ask them to share in, the work of fittingly celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary as Pope of Leo XIII. The venerable Pontiff has already passed the middle of his twenty-fifth year as the Vicar of Christ, and if God spare him so long, on the twentieth of February next he will have occupied the Chair of St. Peter longer than any other Sovereign Pontiff, save only one, since the time of St. Peter himself. It is an event so extraordinary for the Catholic world that our rejoicing and gratitude should receive universal expression. With this end in view, a solemn world-wide act of Homage to Jesus Christ our Divine Redeemer is proposed in thanksgiving to Almighty God for the prolongation of the life and illustrious Pontificate of Leo XIII.

Besides the particular manner each may choose for manifesting his Catholic sentiments, in order to secure uniformity the International Committee appointed to look after the Jubilee commemoration has suggested that the faithful throughout the world join in:

1. *Public Prayer* for the Holy Father by reciting the *Oremus pro Pontifice Nostro*, as follows: "Let us pray for our Sovereign Pontiff. May the Lord preserve him, and give him health and happiness, and not deliver him into the hands of his enemies." *Our Father* and *Hail Mary*.[1]

2. *Pilgrimages to Rome*, as an external manifestation and an attestation of our loyalty to the Holy See.

3. A *small offering* may be contributed by all, rich and poor,

[1] Indulgence of 300 days, once a day. A plenary indulgence may be gained once a month, if the above prayer is recited once each day during the month.—Pius IX, November 26, 1876.

old and young, without exception, as a tribute of filial love to the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

4. Subscription to the memorial *Gold Tiara* to be presented to the Pope on behalf of the whole Catholic world. This collective gift from the faithful to the second of the Popes of the 262 since the reign of St. Peter to reach his twenty-fifth year as ruler of the Universal Church, will be presented on February 20, 1903, and will be first worn by His Holiness Leo XIII at the services on March 3, 1903.

The artistic execution of this Tiara is in the hands of Mr. Auguste Milani, who has been very happy in overcoming the difficulties, symbolical, historical, and technical, that the work presented. In designing this work of art, Mr. Milani has built the three crowns on lines of singular simplicity. The three coronets of pure gold stand out in high relief, and are richly ornamented, without, however, any sacrifice of their heraldic character. Around the band of each runs a legend explanatory of the meaning of the triple power given to Christ's Vicar on earth. The body of the Tiara is wrought in silver. In the lower section, between the fleurons of the first coronet, are set six medallions, on three of which are depicted St. Peter, Pius IX, and Leo XIII, the three Popes of their illustrious line who governed the Church for twenty-five years. From the base of the design spring six olive branches, whose twigs entwine the medallions, and, passing under the second coronet, flower in the upper section where they encircle two more medallions, one inclosing the image of our Divine Redeemer represented as the Good Shepherd, the other the seal of the Solemn Homage. The third coronet sits gracefully below the globe and cross which surmount the cap of the Tiara.

THE FRENCH GOVERNMENT AND THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

The French Associations Law has provoked much comment, but also much misapprehension, among Catholics and non-Catholics alike. The question is asked: Why do not the Religious Orders comply with the Law? For, granted that it is aimed against the Catholic Church, submission is better than resistance, which provokes violence, and in some cases even bloodshed. If

some of the Religious Orders could reconcile it with their consciences to comply with the Law, why should others refuse to do so at the risk of public disorder and loss to themselves? It is inconsistent on the part of ecclesiastical heads not to urge uniform action in this matter. So say they who do not understand the actual situation of the Religious Orders, or the character of the new Law; and so say the anti-Catholic newspapers that favor the expulsion of the Religious.

The fact is, that the makers of the new Associations Law, who aimed at the extinction of certain Orders, without wishing to appear hostile to their religion, had made it impossible for the said Orders to comply with the Law. This was effected in two ways. First, as has been proved in the French law courts, by a partial promulgation of the Law, so that certain houses did not, and could not have, become properly cognizant of its penal provisions before the term of application for authorization had lapsed. Secondly, and this is the principal reason why the Orders have not taken what might seem the more peaceful course of action—the Law, when fully ascertained, presents such a complication of clauses as to allow its altogether arbitrary interpretation against the Orders singled out for special odium by the reactionary party at present in power. For, whilst to the ordinary reader of newspapers this law appears to be a mere measure of self-defence, forced upon the Republican Government by the reputed political intrigues of the Clerical party in France, it is in reality a systematic attempt to discredit religion and to remove its checking influence upon the atheistic movement of the controlling party. That influence is positively felt to come from the Religious Orders; hence these must go.

That this is no exaggerated party statement is evident from the reports of the discussions in the French Senate which have led up to the enforcement as well as the making of the Law. Apart from the official documents covering the last three years, and published in the *Journal Official de la République Française* which reports the *procès-verbal* for the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate, we have the explicit testimony of Henri Barboux, who as a prominent representative of the Liberal-Republican party, with no regard for the Catholic Church, explains the purpose and

bearing of the Associations Bill merely from the lawyer's standpoint. His comments, criticizing the judicial character of the whole proceeding which bears the Waldeck-Rousseau stamp of opposition to any form of religion, has been published in a brochure entitled "*Le projet de loi sur les Associations.* Publications du Comité," etc.

But let the reader judge for himself why a number of the Congregations should, as soon as they became cognizant of the character of the Law, have preferred to take the road to exile; while others who wished to try the experiment of applying for authorization, have lived a precarious life with the sword hanging over their heads, and with no means of knowing whether they have not, as Father Gerard, S.J., says, by their submission placed themselves more helplessly in the hands of their enemies and facilitated the work of their spoliation.

It must be understood at the outset that there are in France as elsewhere certain Religious Congregations which, for one reason or another, have thought it wise to obtain an official incorporation for the purpose of holding property or pursuing their special avocation under the nominal protection of the law. Thus Hospitals, Technical Schools, Protectories and similar institutions are enabled to transact their affairs as business men do who combine as a corporation with financial responsibilities.

Other religious communities, whose members simply desire to labor for themselves, combine as a family for private ends and by their own private means, just as any number of persons might unite on a charitable project and live together under a common rule for the purpose of carrying out their pious aims. These latter unions, basing their action on that universally conceded freedom of aggregation for a good or useful end, so long as they abide by the laws of the land, have been proscribed by the new Associations Law, under the plea that they furnish a political danger to the State, inasmuch as they might conceal enemies of the Republic who are under control of a foreign potentate, a Pope, and a General of the Order, whom they are bound to obey, yet who is not himself chargeable before the courts of France. It is clear that this allegation might be made against any Catholic who professes allegiance to the Roman Pontiff, if he associate with others of his faith

pledging himself to the defence of the interests of his Church. There are other no less arbitrary possibilities of disloyalty alleged against the Orders taking the triple vow of Religion, as a pretext to justify the action of the French Government, into which it is needless to enter here. Let us, however, briefly review the Law itself and see if it do not bear the mark of hateful discrimination and partisan opposition to the Religious against whom it is directed. We shall quote simply from the requirements of the Law as summarized by Father Gerard, editor of the London *Month*, in a pamphlet recently published by the Messrs. Longmans, Green and Company on this particular subject, in which he appeals with fact and date to the fair judgment of Englishmen against the misrepresentations of the metropolitan press.

What has to be done by a Congregation which desires to obtain authorization? The conditions are laid down by the Council of State:

"In the first place, an application for authorization must be addressed to the Minister of the Interior; it must be signed by the official representatives of the applicant body, with vouchers for the authenticity of their signatures; and it must be accompanied by two copies of the statutes of the congregation. There must be supplied at the same time a full list of all the property of the congregation, movable or immovable, and of all its establishments. Should authorization be granted, it will cover only the establishments thus specified; permission to found a new one must be sought in the same manner as the original authorization of the body. The financial condition of the institute must be annually reported to the Government of the State. There must likewise be a full and searching report of the *personnel*. In the case of associations which are not religious in character, it is sufficient to supply the names of the directors,—but by no means will this suffice in our case. Every individual member must be enumerated, his family name, Christian name, and name in religion, his age, place of birth, and nationality. If he should formerly have belonged to another religious congregation, full information as to it must be furnished, its style and title, the object for which it is designed, and its geographical situation, the dates at which he entered and left it, and the name by which he was known in it. There must be a complete record up to date of the history of each individual since he

joined the congregation to which he actually belongs—how he has been employed at each successive period, in what function and in what place. There must also be a statement of his pecuniary relations with the congregation. Any failure to supply accurate information upon these subjects will be a criminal offence, and whereas in the case of other associations the maximum penalty for such a transgression is a fine of 200 francs, for religious that maximum is raised to 5,000 francs, or a year's imprisonment. It is perfectly obvious that a congregation which is not destined to obtain authorization, by supplying all these particulars simply commits the happy despatch, for it must effectually secure its own extinction, by enabling its destroyers to lay their hand at once upon every stick or straw of its property, and by marking out every individual belonging to it, as a person to be excluded from every species of work which those in power do not wish religious men to do.

"The application must likewise contain a declaration on the part of the congregation and all its members that they submit themselves to the jurisdiction of the local ordinary, and another from the said Bishop, engaging himself to receive them as his subjects.

"Should it be found duly *en règle*, the application is next to be referred to the municipal council of the locality in which the congregation desires to be established, as also the *préfet* of the district, in order to obtain the opinion of these functionaries, both as to the merits of the congregation itself, its institute and its purposes, and as to the desirability of allowing it to settle in their neighborhood. Should this double ordeal be safely passed, all must again come up for the judgment of the Cabinet, and, finally, should the Ministry also prove propitious, it will go before the chambers, with whom rests the final decision of the whole affair."

To what length persecution can be pushed in the name of a law which inaugurates simply a system of espionage and personal tyranny, has been already proved by numberless instances of attempted application in the provinces. Petty magistrates and prefects have sought to vindicate their official prerogatives; for the Prefect of a Department has, as Fr. Gerard points out (p. 61), the right "at any hour of the day or night to demand admittance" to a religious house and "to every room within it. He must be at full liberty to see every inmate, putting to him or her what questions he sees fit." Is it any wonder that the Religious, many

of them highly educated and refined, and possessed of the delicate sense of modesty which their mode of living cultivates, should resent this sort of intrusion and resist? We who know what most Religious are, would take up their personal defence, as do the good French people in the Catholic districts.

Father Gerard sums up his analysis of the French Associations Law in the following points:

"1. It originated with the extremist section of the Radicals, who forced it upon the Ministry of M. Waldeck-Rousseau as a condition of their support, who regard it as a first step in their campaign against Christianity, or even religious belief in any form.

"2. It constitutes a gross violation of the fundamental principles of liberty, depriving men and women of rights common to all, without any excuse; for although there have been accusations brought against those whom it affects, there has been no attempt to substantiate such charges.

"3. Those of the party now in power who wish in any form to tolerate the Church or institutions belonging to her, are manifestly determined to do so only on condition of making her to the fullest extent the vassal of the State, and stamping her as a mere human institution for State purposes: that is to say, they will endure her on condition that she will renounce the only claim upon which her existence can be justified."

Criticisms and Notes.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS ad mentem S. Thomae et S. Alphonsi, hodiernis moribus accommodata. De Poenitentia, de Matrimonio et Ordine. Auctore Ad. Tanquerey, S.S. Tornaci: Desclée, Lefebvre et Soc.; Parisiis: Letouzey et Ané; Neo Eboraci et Chicagii: Benziger Brothers; Baltimore: St. Mary's Seminary. 1902. Pp. 628—34.

To those who have become familiar with the eminently practical and timely edition of Father Tanquerey's *Course of Dogmatic Theology*, it is superfluous to recommend a volume on the Moral and Pastoral disciplines from the same gifted author. He has the faculty of seizing what is of real and present use, and of discarding mere speculation or historical reference which, whilst serving as illustration of a principle, does as often obscure its ready application to modern actualities. This consideration has been recognized of late years as an important item in the preparation of theological text-books, especially for those who, being obliged to devote themselves entirely to the pastoral care, find little leisure for speculative study and the discussion of theoretical positions or purely hypothetical cases of conscience. Father Tanquerey adheres to the teaching of St. Thomas, and establishes his scientific groundwork in the admirably formulated principles which the Angelic Doctor lays down in the chapters of the *Summa* regarding morality and virtue. St. Alphonsus is, of course, the high court of appeal, where sagacity and prudence determine the just application of scholastic dictates of reason and faith to moral action.

The special value of our author's attempt to supply a timely text for students of moral theology in missionary countries, notably in England and the United States, is apparent, particularly in the treatment of the second part, *De Matrimonio*. Here we have not only constant reference to sources of information, such as a complete summary of the laws on divorce in the different States, which we miss in other text-books, but we find very explicit guidance for removing difficulties which a parish priest is apt to meet with in marriage complications. This is of great service to a pastor who is expected to straighten out matrimonial troubles both before the public and in conscience, and generally at short notice. Thus the reason, character,

and form of various dispensations are given in their pertinent connection and in continuous paragraphs, so that together with the solution of a case requiring dispensation the method of obtaining the latter is placed within a student's reach. In like manner the scheme of consaguinity and affinity is worked out with elaborate detail, making immediate location of an impediment and its degree comparatively easy.

It is needless to say that beyond the manner of emphasizing what is of present importance in the treatment of moral questions by means of the fundamental principles viewed in the light of recent legislation, ecclesiastical and civil, our author does not greatly deviate from his predecessors in the same field. His aim was to render service to the clergy who presently labor in the care of souls, and this object he has, we think, attained in a marked degree. The style of his writing is clear even in parts where prolixity has been hitherto considered inseparable from the subject-matter. Here and there the phrasing might, indeed, be criticized, as when, for example, the author speaks of the obligation to have the Cæsarean section performed by a physician and not by a priest: "propter periculum scandali quod multi exinde paterentur; nam minus est malum infantem sine baptismate mori, quam scandalum multis adultis dari." (Supplem., p. 32, n. 69.) The bald statement *minus est malum* in this case might, if taken in its obvious sense, be easily construed to supply a general pretext for neglecting the duty of saving souls when the method of doing so is liable to rouse serious misunderstanding; a happier phrase implying "ad tale remedium (pro sacerdote extraordinarium) non tenetur cui jactura famae ex eo adhibito eventura esset," would accomplish the intended end without coining a maxim suggesting that the salvation of a soul is of minor importance and apt to work mischief in the pastoral field, since it could be applied to other instances where it would not hold good.

A BOOK OF ORATORIOS. Compiled by the Rev. Robert Eaton, of the Birmingham Oratory. With Discourses by the Very Rev. H. I. D. Ryder, D.D., the Very Rev. F. W. Keating, D.D., the Rev. Ralph Blakelock, and the Rev. Basil Maturin; and a Preface by the Bishop of Birmingham. London: Published by the Catholic Truth Society. 1902. Pp. 148.

The Fathers of the Birmingham Oratory have for some years past made efforts to introduce into the devotional services at their church that particular form of musical prayer which owes its origin to St. Philip

Neri and is known as the Sacred Oratorio. The present generation knows only the later and considerably secularized form of this style of sacred music, as we have it in "The Passion" and "Christmas Oratorio" by Sebastian Bach, or Handel's "Messiah," Haydn's "Creation," Beethoven's "Mount Olivet," Mendelssohn's "Elias," and Gounod's "Redemption," or "Mors et Vita." But these charming and elevating works are merely artistic developments of the *Laudi* written by Palestrina and Animuccia to accompany the spiritual exercises introduced by St. Philip. The lovable patron saint of the Roman youth was fond of music and knew how to employ its sweet enticements, because he felt that through it "ineffable gladness and gentleness and grace" could be imparted to piety. "Take away from the saint his delight in music," writes Cardinal Capecelatro in his biography, "and you leave his image despoiled of much of its winning beauty."

That this spirit of sacred joy peculiar to the school of St. Philip may be effectually revived through the same means which he employed to draw it forth, has been in great part demonstrated at the English Oratory; and the work of Father Eaton is not only a proof of this, but at the same time shows the way in which it may be done by others. The plan presented in the manual before us is to describe, by a series of motets strung together and selected from various sources, some subject or mystery of faith in its various aspects, leaving to the preacher who presides over the exercises the task of driving home the lesson of music.

Let us take by way of illustration one of the twelve Oratorios which are here furnished, *libretti* and sermons accompanying. For instance, the *Oratorio on the House of God.* In the first part of this Oratorio an attempt is made to describe the chief features of the interior of a Catholic church. On entering we at once feel that this is "no other but the House of God," conscious as we are of the Real Presence, and we exclaim with the Psalmist, "How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord!"

The organ prelude ends in an intonation of Guilmant's *Quam dilecta tabernacula tua Domine* (motet for four voices). Then the Christian is reminded of the principal features with which he is familiar within the House of God. As our attention is fixed on the Baptismal Font near the entrance of the Church where we were regenerated and received into the Church of Christ, the choir takes up the elevating strains of Sewell's *Vidi aquam egredientem.* We then

move along toward the front, and as we pass the Stations of the Cross, symbolic expression of the Christian's sorrowful pilgrimage on earth, a tenor solo with alternating chorus chants *Fac me tecum piè flere*, from the Cantata of the *Stabat Mater* by Dwrak. Reaching the pulpit, we are reminded of Isaias' words: "How beautiful upon the hills are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings and preacheth peace!" by the singing of the motet *Quam pulchri sunt pedes*, from Gounod's "Redemption." Thus the devotion continues, halting at the altar of our Blessed Lady and of St. Joseph, stopping for a moment at the Confessional to reflect on its saving power in Hummel's consoling strains *Quodquod in orbe revinxeris*, until we reach the high altar, where the Centre of our worship dwells. Here the choir or the whole congregation chant the *Tantum Ergo*. Then follows the sermon on the subject of *The Beauty of God's House*, or some kindred topic.

The remaining eleven themes which Father Eaton has selected for illustration of this work are on *The Creator and Creature*, *The Incarnation of our Lord*, *The Life of our Lord*, *The Passion*, *The Church*, *The Blessed Sacrament*, *Our Blessed Lady*, *The Kingdom of Christ*, *Life after Death*, *The Virtue of Charity*, *The Life and Virtues of St. Philip Neri*. A printed sheet serving as libretto is given to those attending the devotions, so that they may easily become familiar with the train of thought that leads the devotion.

It will readily be admitted that this sort of devotion is not only attractive, but is also of great practical and instructive value if properly conducted. "To produce an Oratorio in this fashion," says the author in the Preface, "has many advantages. It enriches the *répertoire* of the choir; it stimulates the zeal and interest of its members; and the occasion brings together a large number of people." The Bishop of Birmingham, who attended these devotions, testifies to their impressive character. "My own feeling," he writes, "was that we were assisting, not at a musical entertainment, but at a religious function. The mysterious truths of faith were set before us in the inspired words of Holy Scripture and of the Church's Liturgy; and classical music, as expressive and appropriate as could be found, was selected and composed for the setting. But the theme dominated, as it was meant to do; the music was subsidiary, and served as a medium of expression to the theme; thus our minds were lifted heavenwards, and our hearts were stirred with unearthly emotions by turns of joy and praise, of thanksgiving and supplication. This was a marked feature of those Oratories at which I had the good fortune to assist.

So much so, that when the music ceased and gave place to the spoken word, one felt that the preacher's task was half done: for the mind had been withdrawn from the outer world, and occupied with spiritual things, and thus was better disposed to attend to the central truth to be propounded by the preacher."

THE DANGERS OF SPIRITUALISM. Being Records of Personal Experiences, with Notes and Comments and Illustrations. By a member of the Society for Psychical Research. With the Approbation of the Most Rev. Archbishop of St. Louis, Mo. London: Sands & Co.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 153.

A member of the Society for Psychical Research, who from motives of scientific study has earnestly devoted himself for years to the investigation of the reality of spiritualistic manifestations, expresses in this volume the conviction that spiritualism as a cult is one of the greatest dangers that beset the religious and curious mind in modern society. He believes that this cult is not a merely passing phase of human inquisitiveness, but that it shows signs of a permanent hold, furnishing as it does food for the inborn craving after the mysterious, and promising to answer the questions of those who believe in the immortality of the soul without accepting the saving restraints imposed by a dogmatic faith. There is, too, as the author says, a manifest reaction from that crude materialistic creed of the last century which is too strongly opposed to our normal instinct to form a permanent system of philosophy; and this fact also favors the tendencies of spiritualistic inquiry.

The author's object, in view of this fact, is to add his own testimony to the reality and objectivity of many of those abnormal phenomena which have in recent years been frequently the subject of inquiry and discussion among the representatives of psychical science at our leading schools and universities. His conclusion is not only that the manifestations which men experience at times of a spirit-world, are an unquestionable reality, but also that they constitute a grave danger to those who from a sense of curiosity or mistaken duty attempt to meddle with them. "It is a fact universally acknowledged and admitted even by experienced spiritualists, that the influence of the *séance*-room is on the whole debasing, and that it tends to banish all true devotional feeling and true religion." Of the truth of this we should hold ourselves convinced from the occasional glimpses that

reach the public of the transactions of spiritualistic assemblies and the open advertisements of the mediums. It is true, no doubt, also that at times individuals of sceptical disposition have found in these manifestations some awakening of their dormant spiritual faculty; and that in a few cases honest inquirers have been thus led back to a belief in the supernatural, and even to the true Church. For as soon as they realized that this spirit-world, of which they had experienced a sense of reality, had alternate spheres; that there was evil and apparent good strangely commingled; that human fraud supplemented the fitful agency of the unevenly controlled spirit manifestations,—their minds brought them logically to the causes of these things and to the recognition of the one supreme Spirit on whose power all natural and preternatural operations depend. But such results as these latter are rare exceptions, and most of the unsuspecting persons who are drawn into the maelstrom of spiritualism become its victims.

So far as the general public is concerned, the author believes that it is of the utmost importance that the action upon us of the unseen spiritual universe (which the spiritualistic phenomena go to demonstrate) should be fully known and realized; for, according to his observations, it is in the denial of the reality of these facts, which attributes them simply to trickery and delusion, that the chief danger lies. "A person who believes, or who at least thinks it probable, that intelligent agencies, external to the inquirer, may be at work in producing the phenomena in question, is far more likely to proceed with caution and circumspection, than he who imagines that they may be attributed to some unknown occult force, or to the action of his own submerged and hitherto but little understood personality."

If it be asked what are specifically the dangers arising out of spiritualistic experiences or experiments, we should answer in one word that it brings us back to the pagan cult of pre-Christian times; for it fosters a sort of modernized demon worship with its oracles, as at Delphi, on the one hand, and its orgies, as at Olympus, on the other. The volume before us gives the actual experiences of one who took up the inquiry as a scientist, but who felt the moral responsibility devolving upon him throughout, and thus found himself enabled to draw salutary lessons from the things he witnessed and tested. The book has the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of St. Louis, which is an attestation of its moral purpose and freedom from whatever might offend Catholic sensibility.

FROM THE HEARTH TO CLOISTER IN THE REIGN OF CHARLES II. A narrative of Sir John and Lady Warner's so-much-wondered-at Resolution to leave the Anglican Church and enter the Religious Life. By Frances Jackson. London: Burns & Oates.

Every age has its special wonders of divine grace. Assuredly the Restoration in England would seem the most unlikely period for the manifestation of spiritual activities of a high order. The instructive story of Sir John and Lady Warner proves the contrary. Not only does it lay bare the secret workings of devout souls struggling through error to truth, but it shows the still rarer phenomenon of vocation to the religious life given to a young married couple. Conversion at an epoch given up to frivolity and sin would surprise us; but what are we to say of the separation, by mutual consent, of the converted husband and wife, enabling them to become, in the one case, a Jesuit priest, and in the other, a Poor Clare?

The remarkable features of the narrative caused *The Life of Lady Warner*, on which Miss Jackson's book is based, to pass through several editions. The first was published in 1690 and the last in 1858. Father Scarisbrick, its author, deserves at least a word of acknowledgment from the present editor. The title-page as it stands is, to say the least, misleading.

To proceed to the story itself. The interest is twofold: the dogmatic position of the Anglicans, on such topics as the Real Presence and Papal Supremacy, is illustrated by conversations with Dr. Buck, Chaplain-in-ordinary to Charles II, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Dean of Westminster; and there is besides much information on matters relating to the religious life.

With both Sir John Warner and his wife a religious vocation led the way to conversion. Lady Warner was the daughter of Sir Thomas Hanmer, a strenuous Royalist. Educated at a French convent, she early desired to become a nun, although her religious convictions were essentially Protestant. Had it not been for the intervention of her stepmother, she would have entered a Benedictine house with her father's full consent. At the Restoration she was married to Sir John Warner, and entered upon an ideally happy life, being blessed with two children. After the birth of her first daughter she showed her predilection for the religious state by vowing "to bring her up with the same sentiments God had given her of it; hoping she might afterwards embrace that happy life." The variety of Anglican beliefs on the Eucharist awakened doubts in her mind about the whole system in

which she had been born and bred; conversations with her Jesuit relative, Father Hanmer, settled her convictions, so that she touchingly implored her husband, "by the Passion of our Saviour" to permit her to embrace the Catholic faith. The latter urged her to confer with Dr. Buck, a noted Anglican divine, who, however, only confirmed her judgment by the following singularly candid admissions: that "the body of our Saviour was really (in the Sacrament)"; that "praying to Saints was a thing indifferent, Purgatory an opinion grounded upon reason, Confession a necessary and useful thing, and merit as the Roman Catholic Church had defined it." He "agreed to all that the Catholic Church had decreed and offered" [Lady Warner writes] "to bring me to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Sheldon, to be assured that the whole Protestant Church believed the same."

Sir John had similar conversations with the Archbishop and the Dean of Westminster, Dr. Dolbin, who ended by saying "'Twas a mere punctilio the Pope stood upon that hindered the union of both Churches, which he hoped to live to see decided." Whereupon we read that, not unnaturally, Sir John "took his leave, resolving now to embrace (as the securest way) that religion in which both allowed salvation, rather than remain in one where the contrary Church (which the Archbishop allowed to be a true one) denied that any could be saved."

The suggestion that they should embrace the religious state came, strange to say, from the husband, who acted throughout with commendable prudence. It was the Catholic doctrine of purgatory that first enkindled in him the desire to abandon the world, which had led him from God, for a life of laborious penance and expiation for the sins that had to be atoned for here or hereafter. But he did not in any way force his inclinations upon his wife. Father Scarisbrick tells us that the holy couple tested their continence for some months before the act of final separation, and even at the eleventh hour Sir John urged Lady Warner to reconsider the sacrifice if she found it too great, offering to postpone his profession for a year.

Divine grace triumphed over nature, and God abundantly blessed the fruitful coöperation of His servants in the painful step which they took "in the sincere conviction," in which they were not disappointed, "that by thus depriving themselves of temporal enjoyment they made "one another a present of eternal ones."

This singularly interesting story is told with a natural simplicity that

makes it doubly effective. Our only complaint with Miss Jackson is that she is too sparing in her notes, *e. g.*, she might have given us some information as to the sad subsequent history of the priest who was responsible for the two conversions. But we have said enough of the book to show its real value to the Catholics of to-day.

A RELATION OF THE CONFERENCE BETWEEN WILLIAM LAUD, LATE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, AND MR. FISHER, THE JESUIT, by the Command of King James of ever Blessed Memory, etc. A new edition, with Introduction and Notes by C. H. Simpkinson, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford. London and New York: The Macmillan Company.

The biographer of Archbishop Laud sufficiently indicates by his old-world title (which exigencies of space have compelled us to abridge) the purport of a controversial handbook belonging to a type once very prevalent in England. It possesses more than an antiquarian interest. The learned Protestant Bishop Creighton, who contributes the preface, does not hesitate to maintain that it will prove useful to modern Anglican divines, although with characteristic caution he hesitates to commit himself to its theology. To Catholics it will prove valuable as an historical document testifying at first hand to the trend of doctrinal belief of the most representative member of the Church of England at a critical time. This is especially the case in regard to Eucharistic belief. Cardinal Newman's judgment is well known. In his introduction to Mr. A. W. Hutton's work on Anglican Orders, he denies that the Real Presence in the Catholic sense was taught by any of the great English theological writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is true that many of them use the term, as, for instance, Cosin in his *History of Transubstantiation*, and Andrewes in his reply to Bellarmine;[1] but it is plain from their own words elsewhere[2] that they place an un-Catholic interpretation on the formula. At first sight, Laud in the present work would seem to be an exception. For, although he scouts the notion of Transubstantiation which "the primitive Church [an elastic term] did not dream of, and which the learned of the Roman party dare not understand properly," he states plumply, "Nothing is more plain

[1] *Minor Works*, Anglo-Cath. Libr., p. 13. *Cf.* his *Sermons*, Vol. 2, p. 327, and Thorndike, "The eating and drinking of the Lord's Body and Blood in the Sacrament presuppose the being of it in the Sacrament."

[2] See especially Cosin, *Works*, I, 174, and V. 345, Anglo-Cath. Libr.

than that [the Church of England] believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist." Yet we have only to read further to find that he understands by "the real presence" the purely Calvinistic doctrine of a subjective presence in the heart of the faithful receiver. He proceeds to abuse Bellarmine for his "ignorance or malice" in denying that the Sacramentarians assert Christ to be present really and objectively, and asks indignantly does not Calvin himself say, on Bellarmine's own showing, that we "*partake* of Christ's Body truly . . . , together with the sign God truly *presents to us* the true Body and Blood of Christ." But he shows thereby a palpable confusion of thought, in failing to distinguish between a Presence given in the act of Communion and one altogether independent of it. His idea of the Real Presence is practically identical with that of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who lays down that Christ is "present to our spirits only . . . not to any other sense but that of faith . . . [by] spiritual susception." [3]

Laud shows an equal misconception of Papal Infallibility, when he claims to disprove it on the grounds that some Popes have been great sinners, that they have wrongly taught image-worship and transubstantiation, and that, on the Catholic theory of intention—which he likewise wofully misunderstands—no one can be certain that any Pope is Pope.

The positive side of the book is small, in comparison with that taken up with the attempted destruction. Out of the fifteen chapters, under such pompous headings as "The Fundamentals of Faith," the "Authority of General Councils," "Security of the English Church," "The Uncertain Refuge Offered by the Roman Church," only two or three prove, on examination, to be an attempted defence of the Anglican position. There is much verbiage, much controversial claptrap about the "shifts" of Stapleton, "the cunning devices" of Bellarmine, many unsupported generalizations, a great deal of venomous controversial bitterness, happily redolent of a bygone age; but little of solid argument, or of facing squarely the points of his opponent. Laud's dogmatic tone, as of one speaking from a secure citadel, and the archaic quaintness of his diction, are well illustrated in the chapter where he dilates *more Anglicano* on the authority of General Councils and their relation to Scripture:

[3] Real Presence, I, 8. *Works* (ed. 1852), Vol. 6, p. 17.

"To hold Councils to . . . order, settle, and define differences arisen concerning faith . . . is apparent apostolical tradition written; but the power which Councils so held have, is from the whole Catholic Church, whose members they are; and the Church's power from God. . . . If the Council be lawfully called, and proceed orderly, and conclude according to the rule, the Scripture, the whole Church cannot but approve the Council, and then the definitions of it are binding. . . . Nor doth this open any gap to private spirits; for all decisions in such a Council are binding; and because the whole Church can meet in no other way, the Council shall remain the supreme, external, living, temporary, ecclesiastical judge of all controversies; only the whole Church hath power, when Scripture or demonstration is found . . . to represent herself again in a new Council, and in it to order what was amiss."

It need only be added that Mr. Simpkinson has done his part in a thoroughly praiseworthy way. His notes are terse and to the point, containing much interesting matter. But he might, with advantage, have stated at the beginning that the title-page is a misnomer. There can be no "Conference" when only one party to the dispute is given a hearing. Except for occasional comments by Father Fisher and a certain "A. C.," the book is really nothing but an elaborate one-sided controversial treatise by Archbishop Laud.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1902.

Dr. Fairbairn is already well known as a scholarly writer on the fundamental aspects of Christianity. His latest work adds considerably to his reputation for brilliancy of argument couched in an attractive style. It is possible, indeed, that he allows himself here and there to be carried away by a torrent of rhetoric when we should expect a sobriety of language in keeping with the depth and solidity of his thought. Yet that defect, after all, will probably only popularize the book the more among that large class of readers who welcome a philosophical defence of the grounds of faith, if only dryness and heaviness are absent from its exposition.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first, the author confines himself to an examination of nature in its largest sense, showing successfully that it is not incompatible with the existence of a supernatural order, even as it involves the being and operation of God. In the second division, which will commend itself most to the general reader, we are given a searching scrutiny of the Gospels and chief Pauline Epistles, leading to a striking argument for the Divinity of Christ drawn from His own testimony by word and work, and that of

His nearest companions and earliest biographers. Dr. Fairbairn is at his best when he meets rationalists on their own ground and confutes them from their own premises. Thus, in the first part of his work, he takes Hume's argument against miracles, dissects it mercilessly, and shows that on his own principles such occurrences are not merely possible but probable. Similarly, in the second part, the miraculous element in the Gospels is strictly historical, for internal evidence abundantly testifies that it is narrated by sane unemotional men making a faithful "study from life" of a Person whose Divinity could no more be hid than the sun shining in the heavens. If Christ were God, the extraordinary thing would be for no miracles to have been wrought by Him. The Gospels bear on their face the mark of truth, just because they describe His life as in keeping with His claims. It was "miraculous because it articulated and manifested the supernatural Person."

An additional argument for Christ's Divinity illustrates the unity of design which runs throughout the book. In the earlier part, after a lengthy survey of the various religions of the world—Buddhism and Confucianism are particularly well sketched—Dr. Fairbairn points out that monotheism found its permanent home "in the face of the mightiest adverse forces, . . . unsupported by the fellowship or countenance of kindred ideas," in the religion of Israel. This unquestioned fact is pressed home with striking effect when the author comes to consider the theory of an apotheosis of Christ by the Evangelists as an explanation of their deification of Him in their narrative. For the narrators are *Jews*, bred and soaked in monotheistic ideas, who would be the very men least likely to portray their human Master in a mythical form as God of God.

Another instance of the unity characteristic of the work is the careful way in which the connection between Hebraism and Christianity is worked out. The one religion that "contained the most universal idea," whose Scriptures told "the people that God was not restricted to their border, but in the Law a hedge was set round them that His name might be preserved for all mankind," yet remained stationary and national. It needed the development of Christianity in the authorized form of Catholicism (which unfortunately Dr. Fairbairn fails to grasp) to transfer it from an exclusive and local religion to one missionary and world-wide, in which distinctions of race, sex, and civilization were lost.

Space does not permit us to review at length the interesting, it

more technical sections on the witness of conscience to a Supreme Lawgiver who has impressed His mandates, with their sanctions and penalties, on the "fleshy tablets" of the human heart—an argument familiarized to Catholics by Cardinal Newman; but a word of praise is due to the excellent summary of Kant's famous analysis of the Categorical Imperative—the unconditioned "Thou shalt," impervious alike to the clamor of passion and the uprising of rebellious self-will, that speaks from within the depths of personality with the peremptory voice of an eternal judge, and warning us that we cannot with impunity disregard its commands, points unmistakably to the Author of all moral law as its source.

It would be wrong to deny that there are passages in the book which will not commend themselves to Catholics. We cannot follow Dr. Fairbairn in his unsupported assertion that, while "Moses may have been the legislator of the family, yet he was not its sole or sovereign authority in religion; others stand by his side, *come after him, rise above him, and even supersede him.*" We may reasonably ask who where these "other" superior teachers who placed in the shade the Mosaic authority. Our author is discreetly silent as to their identity. Modern Jews, no less than Christians, would, we imagine, dispute their existence, as they assuredly would the further statement that "the monotheistic idea is [Israel's] *sole claim* to remembrance."

And it is surprising to find that a writer of Dr. Fairbairn's undoubted attainments is so ignorant of the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as to gravely assert that it "logically" leads to the attribution of sinless parentage to all ancestors of Mary.

But these defects cannot in fairness be said to materially detract from the sterling worth of a book that must take high place in the ranks of apologetic theological literature, having for its object one dearer to Catholics than to others—the solid defence of Christianity on a rational basis.

LIFE OF JOHN WALTER WALSHE, F.S.A. Edited with an Introduction by Montgomery Carmichael. London: John Murray.

The subject of this elaborate literary mystification may best be described as a lay St. Francis. Mr. Carmichael is one of the greatest living authorities on everything relating to the "poor man of Assisi," and he has incorporated much of his learning in a fictitious biography. The captious critic may complain that the "editor" sets out to mislead the reader by a parade of accuracy and a wealth of personal de-

tail out of place in a romance: certainly he goes too far when he labels a pure work of fiction as "the true inward history of a soul." But in truth it does not need much critical discernment to rightly apprize the historical value of a "Life" so overloaded with *minutiae* of thought, sentiment, and self-introspection, as to be little short of autobiographical, if true.

The story is briefly thus: John Walter Walshe, the son of respectable parents, was born at Manchester in the early part of the last century. A mystic almost from his cradle, he found himself, not unnaturally, unhappy in the rough-and-tumble life of a Yorkshire school no less than, later, amidst the commonplace surroundings of his father's country house. As a school-boy he saw visions and dreamed dreams, was consoled spiritually by a vivid sense of communion with the Divine, was even on occasions wrapt in ecstasy. Dissatisfied with the cold formalism of Anglicanism, he found his home by way of Methodism in the Catholic Church. The natural bent of his character was given scope for its due exercise by his chance meeting at Leghorn (where curiously enough Mr. Carmichael is British Consul) with Lord Frederick Markham, who adopted him, educated him, made him librarian in his palazzo at Lucca, and finally became his father-in-law. His patron is a delightful character of a type fast becoming extinct—a nobleman in the true sense of the word, religious to the core, artistic, literary, cultured, the fosterer of everything that tended to elevate mankind. On the death of his parents and of Lord Markham, Mr. Walshe settled at Assisi, a rich widower able to prosecute his favorite Franciscan studies intermingled with the rigors of a semi-monastic life devoted to prayer, penance, contemplation, and good works. He died there in the odor of sanctity on July 2, 1900, leaving to his son Philip Egidius Walshe (who purports to be the author of the present biography) a wealth of literary material on St. Francis and his early followers, on heraldric and archæological lore, not to speak of palæography—on all of which subjects he was a past-master.

His character is sketched with peculiar charm. A man of great powers of affection, most gentle and winning in his ways, alive to the beauties of nature, full of the truest human sympathy, his sanctity belonged to the order of St. Francis and of St. Philip. Yet his mortifications were heroic. His "biographer" relates with an almost painful realism his scourgings, his fastings, his prolonged religious exercises. They seem excessive in anybody but a saint. So, too, like many converts, he seems to have been over-ready to show his new-

born fervor by exaggerating the object of faith. Thus he seems to have believed in the prophecies of St. Malachy which, "though originally a forgery, God had made to come true."

In spite of the somewhat tedious digressions on abstruse subjects, more suitable for a technical treatise than a novel for the multitude, the *Life of John Walter Walshe* is likely to command a large sale among Catholics, if only for its presentation of a singularly attractive personality, a modern counterpart of St. Francis of Assisi.

We must, however, in the interests of the ordinary reader, protest strongly against the literary hoax perpetrated by a pure work of fiction being allowed to masquerade in the garb of a sober biography.

Literary Chat.

We receive simultaneously the *De Fide Divina*, by the late Father Wilmers, S.J., and the second volume of his *Lehrbuch der Religion*, dealing with the ten articles (2–12) of the Apostles' Creed that embody the life of our Lord and the Church. Both volumes are edited by the indefatigable Father Lehmkuhl, whose theological works have made him immortal in our ecclesiastical schools. The *Lehrbuch* is in its sixth edition, whilst the first-mentioned work is posthumous and bears the mark of the affectionate relation which existed between the venerable author and his present editor.

St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, issues its first catalogue at the end of the ninth year of its scholastic activity. The institution has become a centre of ecclesiastical training for the United States, and presents a phenomenal growth, as is evidenced by the fact that two-thirds of its students are inscribed as residents from eighteen dioceses. This is a rare testimony of the confidence on the part of the Hierarchy in the thoroughness of the system of education over which Bishop McQuaid presides and to which as the founder of the Seminary he devotes his energetic care. There are fourteen regular professors attached to the theological school, most of whom have taken their degrees in one or other of the great European Universities, such as Rome, Innsbruck, Louvain, Halle. The Professor of English Literature is a Cornell graduate. A feature which guarantees the continuance of the present prosperity of the Seminary is the endowment of professorships, five of which have already been secured. There is also a number of Burses for the maintenance of students affiliated to the Diocese of Rochester.

The venerable head of the firm of Frederick Pustet & Company, publishers of numerous liturgical works which for their textual accuracy and bibliotechnic perfection have merited the title of typical editions, died on the fourth of August at the age of seventy-one. The sterling qualities of Chevalier Pustet, which showed themselves

in his character as Catholic publisher by continued large-minded and disinterested enterprise in the field of ecclesiastical literature, had gained for him the marked favor of the Sovereign Pontiffs Pius IX and Leo XIII. He was a Knight of the Papal Order of St. Gregory the Great—a distinction which has since been accorded also to the representative of the same firm in the United States—and he enjoyed the intimate friendship of the best literary men in Germany. The Catholic reading world, especially the clergy, has every reason to be proud of those old Publishing Houses, which were founded by scions of the families of Frederick Pustet, Benjamin Herder, and the Swiss Benzigers, all of whom maintain their well-earned reputation for integrity and highmindedness, after several generations of active service in the cause of literary propaganda.

The Longmans of London have published a Manuscript text taken from the library of the late Marquess of Bute. It differs from both the English Sarum and the Aberdeen Rites, and appears to have been copied for the family of the Mortimers (Sir Roger de Mortimer, Mortuomar, lord of Foulis) in Perthshire; though some think that it belonged to some cathedral church, Dunkeld or another. It mentions the Sarum Kalendar as the "usus modernus" of its time, and contains the name of St. Bean, Bishop of Aberdeen in the eleventh century (the Roman Martyrology says, December 16th: *Aberdone in Hibernia*), who resided at Murthlac, and whose feast is here assigned to October. A valuable feature of the MS. is that it gives the complete office of St. Edmund of Canterbury, 1242 (1240), of which only scanty fragments were hitherto known.

The articles of the *International Cyclopædia*, in course of publication by Dodd, Mead and Company, have been for the most part rewritten and are therefore not a mere reëdition of the older work of the same name. The present plan of composition combines the most desirable features of the great national cyclopædias—the Britannica, Brockhaus, the German standard *Conversations-Lexicon*, and Larousse's French cyclopædia. The editors are representative university men—Gilman, of Johns Hopkins; Peck, of Columbia; Colby, of New York. Some of the subjects, written by Catholic professors, are of course treated from the Catholic standpoint. Yet the Catholic reader will hardly consider himself much favored, even in topics that practically are the exclusive domain of his Church, such as *Liturgies* and *Rites*, considering that these subjects are treated by professed Protestants, like the Rev. Mr. Robinson, of the Philadelphia Divinity School. Themes like that of Pastoral and Historical Theology, and in fact the whole range of ecclesiastical studies, which the Catholic Church alone has created and raised into a position of prominence, as well as maintained in their present importance, cannot be viewed fairly by men who are essentially out of sympathy with the traditional belief as to the development and actual merits of these disciplines.

The Rev. Peter Coffey, of Maynooth College, writes an interesting paper in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for August, on "The Hexahemeron and Science," in which he examines the earlier views regarding the work of the six days' creation with the gradual transition toward the theory of simultaneous production. The subject requires complementary treatment in a further article dealing with the modern development of the latter theory, which Father Coffey promises to give.

The last issue (August 21st) of *The Independent* contains a paper entitled "The Present Condition of Catholicity." Under the pseudonym "Prælatus" the writer ventilates, apparently with the view of obtaining the approval of a non-Catholic public, his discontent with the condition of the Church in Latin countries. He believes that the traditional methods of the Continental school are partly responsible for this, and he scoffs at the idea of following the scholastic system of study. "One institution for the salvation of the Catholic intelligence in America is left," he writes, "the University of Washington, the one single Catholic school on the Western continent where there is a spirit of broad and candid scholarship, where it is possible to have free access to the achievements and methods of modern learning, where alone there remains a glimpse of hope for a future intellectual revival." Can this be intended as beneficial to the reputation of the Catholic University? Surely such language defeats its purpose, if we may assume that the author intended to speak in behalf of a broadening of scholarship among Catholics. The radicalism of his views becomes at once apparent in the sweeping statements which suggest the stinging sense of retaliation, as when he writes, "No man whose sole witness of scholarship is that 'visible sign of invisible science,' a Roman Doctorate, is fit to point out to others the methods of scientific study." Such language can only serve to give a handle to bigotry, and must lessen our respect for the breadth and impartiality of the editor of *The Independent* who can give encouragement to the composition of such tirades, contrary to every sense of discretion and truth.

In a well-printed volume of 134 pages translated from the French of Charles Beyart we find an interesting summary of the conditions of Catholic workmen in different countries. The book is entitled *The Workman*, and offers words of advice to the laboring classes and those who are interested in their welfare. The author, whose motto is "Heaven helps those who help themselves," gives sound demonstration of the fact that workmen who remain under the influence of proper religious control will escape the disastrous and demoralizing effects of pretended socialistic reform movements, and will improve their economic conditions. The illustrations which the author makes use of are mainly taken from Belgian life, but they easily admit of wider application.

James Duffy and Co. (Dublin) have published a new (third) impression of Father O'Rourke's *History of the Sixth Famine of 1847*. The work contains copious references to earlier Irish history, throwing light on the causes of the national calamity that has periodically visited one of the most fertile lands under the sun.

The Bishop of Derry, Dr. O'Doherty, is the author of a recent volume entitled *Derriana*, containing essays chiefly relating to the history of the Diocese of Derry. There are also some verses apropos of the same subject. The book is published by Sealy, Bryers and Walker (Dublin).

A work that will recommend itself especially to lovers of ecclesiastical art is the recently published volume on *L'Art Religieux du XIIIe Siècle en France*, by Emile Mâle. It embodies a study of the iconography of the Middle Ages and traces the sources of its inspiration. The work is printed in *de luxe* style, with fine illustrations, by the Paris firm of Armand Colin, and has been crowned by the French Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres

Murray (London) is about to issue a volume, called *The Law of Copyright*, which deals with the law of copyright in books, engravings, and works of art generally, in England and the United States, including the decisions in our American courts up to the present. The book is needed, in view of the uncertain and complicated relations that constantly arise between authors and publishers, of whom there are all sorts, from the Government and University presses down to the newspaper pirate, against whom it is difficult to vindicate one's just right without a knowledge of detailed forms of law on the subject.

Razón y Fe, a periodical, published by the Jesuit Fathers in Madrid (Spain), is steadily increasing its authority as a scientific medium of Catholic thought. It not only publishes articles of historical and philosophical character, but gives also finely illustrated accounts of original laboratory work and astronomical observations made by its own staff at Grenada and other centres of Jesuit education. The superiority of the Jesuit College at Manila is in keeping with this activity of the Order in the department of higher science.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* (July 19) prints an excellent article on the Biblical question dealing with the relations of tradition and progress in exegesis. The author recognizes the lack of sufficient apparatus on the part of the Catholic student to meet properly the aggressive spirit of modern criticism—albeit that lack can easily be explained without discrediting Catholic scholarship. But he advises students of the Bible to recognize the actual condition of things, to discard narrow antipathies and diffidence, as though true science could ever be in real opposition to revealed truth. He urges the student to face and examine the questions at issue without fear, and to set aside all preconceptions resting upon traditional views, when there is sufficiently clear testimony in favor of a new interpretation warranted by a healthy exegesis. Above all he suggests that the professors of Biblical science spend less time in mere discussions about inspiration, canonicity and the like, and devote more energy to the production of something which will make the study of the text of the Bible itself practical. *Lavorare cioe invece di discutere!*

Recent Popular Books.

BEST OF STEVENSON: Alexander Jessup. *Page.* $1.25.

A prettily bound and printed volume of selections giving a just idea of Stevenson's styles of fiction, allegorical, historical, and picaresque. "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," "Markheim," and "Will of the Mill," are given complete, with specimen scenes from "Treasure Island," and "Kidnapped," two long critical papers, and seven poems. A complete list of Stevenson's works, and a preface with citations from many criticisms and eulogies introduce the book which is furnished with an excellent portrait.

BRIDGE OF THE GODS: F. H. Balch. *McClurg.* $1.50.

The legend of the New England missionary who carried Christianity to the Far West as early as the seventeenth century is the basis of this story, which includes much trustworthy information as to the manners, customs, and legends of the Oregon and Washington tribes of Indians. The "bridge" is the stone arch that once spanned the Columbia.

CAP AND GOWN: R. L. Paget. *Page.* $1.25.

Verses from the papers of forty

Protestant colleges, including some co-educational and four female colleges. They are refreshingly free from sentimentalism, and some are surprisingly clever. St. Xavier's is the only Catholic college represented. The book is the third of a series of five.

CHANTICLEER: Violette Hall. *Lothrop.* $1.50.

Their house having been burned, a very happy married pair agree to establish themselves in a woodland hut, imitating Thoreau's mode of life. They extract much amusement from the failures of their imitators and from the wife's attempts at match-making, and they use their savings in charity. The practical difficulties of their scheme are carefully neglected, but the book is pleasant, and it contains some uncommon pictures of forest scenes.

CHIQUITA: Merrill Tileston. *Merrill Co.* $1.50.

The daughter of a Ute chief, the heiress of a productive gold mine, has herself educated, in the hope of being useful to her people, but dies before half her hopes are accomplished. The time is that immediately preceding and following the Meeker massacre, and the general effect is to show the white man as corrupt and unjust, and the savage as an innocent child of nature, whose scalping and murdering are "just his fun."

CONFESSIONS OF A MATCH-MAKING MOTHER: Lillias Campbell Davidson. *Taylor.* $1.50.

The confessions are anything but penitent, being those of a widow who marries off her portionless daughters by clever but innocent scheming, and then marries herself, half for the sake of match-making for the bridegroom's daughters, while waiting until her grandchildren shall be old enough to need her services.

ENGLISH GIRL IN PARIS: Anonymous. *Lane.* $1.50.

Light and amusing sketches of French family life, with a truthful portrait of the French spoiled child, the funniest of all spoiled children. The author is somewhat too fond of English in the style of M. le Prince de Moncontour, but the jest wears very well, and heightens the flavor of the naughtiness of "le petit chou."

FASHIONS IN LITERATURE: Charles Dudley Warner. *Dodd.* $1.20 *net.*

A valuable paper on the education of the negroes living in the United States; studies of social conditions; of the punishment of criminals, and of the newspaper, together with articles on literature and copyright, make up a volume of essays interesting to all American citizens. These papers were among the last written by Mr. Warner, and contain his ripest thought.

FORTUNES OF OLIVER HORN: F. Hopkinson Smith. *Scribner.* $1.50.

A young Baltimorean reared in accordance with Southern traditions, goes to New York just before the Civil War, in the hope of repairing the family fortunes fallen into decay during his father's efforts to perfect a great invention. By inclination, he is an artist, and he comes in contact with the curious art life of that inartistic period and loves one of the pioneers among the female students. His father's intellectual cleverness, unworldliness, and delicate sense of honor, and his mother's womanly strength, and the contrast between them and the heroine's equally honorable but less polished Northern kindred is indicated with great skill, and many detached scenes are very brilliant. An excellent description of the march of the first Northern troops through Baltimore adds a new bit to the mosaic of Civil War fiction, but the growth of the artist and the inventor's years of toil are the main themes.

FUTURE OF WAR: I. S. Bloch. *Ginn.* $1.00.

The closing volume of the author's six-volume work is printed with an introduction by Mr. E. D. Mead, and a long conversation reported by Mr. W. T. Stead from actual talks with the author. The book contains all that is necessary to the ordinary reader desiring an outline of the complete work, and it gives some valuable statistics

concerning Russia. The author's thesis is that war has become so highly dangerous as to be impossible, and that the waste involved in maintaining armies and navies should end.

LITTLE CITIZEN: M. E. Waller. *Lothrop.* $1.50.

A crippled city waif, adopted by a kindly farmer and his wife, leads a group of country boys into serious mischief from pure love of excitement; and a country-bred girl runs away to the city to become a circus rider, and is sharply taught to see her foolishness. Both come under the influence of the modern young philanthropist, the man of private fortune and university education, who ministers to the poor with settlements, free libraries, and clubs. The intention is to present him to children as admirable, and it is well effected, although the author is somewhat extravagant. [Ten to fourteen.]

MICHAEL CARMICHAEL: Miles Sandys. *Laird.* $1.50.

A gambler, having murdered a man who has detected him in cheating at cards, falls into the hands of a more clever villain and is forced into a scheme to defraud a life insurance company. The plot involves four more murders, and in the end the gambler returns to his native town and pursues a decent life. His self-deception is very well indicated, but the author's lack of literary ability makes the story comparatively ineffective, and it is worth noting only for the novelty of its main interest.

MYRA OF THE PINES: Herman Knickerbocker Viele. *Putnam.* $1.50.

The simple love story of this volume is pretty, but the interest of the book lies in the conduct of the heroine's father, a charlatan whose trade of necromancer and fortune-teller is pursued with small regard for the family welfare, and her mother, who earns a slender income by journalism and cheap fiction.

NIGHT SIDE OF LONDON: Robert Machray. *Lippincott.* $2.50.

These sketches, illustrated by Mr. Tom Browne, describe the London of the present century as a place differing widely from the London of 1872, when a book with the same title appeared. It is as decent as may be, not dwelling upon evil or excusing it, and the pictures are good of their kind.

OLD CHARLESTOWN: Timothy Thompson Sawyer *Earle.* $2.00.

The author, three times Mayor of the city of Charlestown, famous as the site of the battle of Bunker Hill, describes it in its flourishing days before its annexation to Boston, and enumerates its worthies, among them Edward Everett, Frederic Tudor, founder of the ice trade, Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, and Starr King and E. H. Chapin, noted Protestant ministers. It contains much matter valuable to the historian, and avoids gossip with extraordinary care.

OLYMPIAN NIGHTS: John Kendrick Bangs. *Harper.* $1.50.

Laboriously wrought descriptions of a modern man's adventures in the Olympus of the present, a dreary spot with the latest "improvements," compose a book wearisome in its attempts to be funny.

ON A DONKEY'S HURRICANE DECK: R. Pitcher Woodward. *Blanchard.* $1.50.

This account of a journey across the continent under certain absurd conditions embodied in a wager is prolix, and dull, and the level of its humor is indicated by its title.

ONE BEFORE: Berry Pain. *Scribners.* $1.50.

An Eastern ring, endowing each wearer with the peculiarities of the previous possessor, is the means of transforming a hectoring, cheeseparing man into an agreeable husband, and of giving a modern Griselda a reasonable degree of spirit. It is an admirable little comedy.

ROMANCE OF LEONARDO DA VINCI: Dmitri Merejkowski. *Putnam.* $1.50.

This is a biography, rather than a romance, and it is founded upon the artist's note-books. It is also an account of his time in Italy with special

attention given to Ludovico Sforza and Cesare Borgia. The author, being a Russian, is by no means respectful of Catholic dignitaries, and ends with prophecies of the future religious and secular supremacy of Russia. The descriptions of manners are too frank for a girl's reading.

SEPARATION: Margaret Lee. *Buckles.* $1.25.

An ingenious demonstration of the trouble likely to arise when two persons really married are living as if both were free. The meddlesome kinsman is made odious, and although quite devoid of any religious sentiment, the book teaches a good lesson while professing to amuse.

STARBUCKS: Opie Read. *Laird.* $1.50.

A novel of rustic life written from the play of the same name. All its conversations are couched in the exaggerated phrases necessary to impress the average audience, are unnatural, and the exits and entrances are so conventional as to be absurd.

STRONGER THAN LOVE: Mrs. Alexander. *Brentano.* $1.50.

A good girl, having attracted the fancy of the man beloved by her kinswoman and benefactress, sends him away and marries a man for whom she has respect and friendship. The rejected suitor soon shows that he is unworthy of any love whatsoever, and the self-sacrificing girl learns to love her husband.

TALES OF DESTINY: Elizabeth G. Jordan. *Harpers.* $1.00.

Three of these stories deal with disreputable journalism and are necessarily unpleasant, and of the other seven one is too enlightening, to put it amiably, for a young reader. Six are excellent in every way, and the book is much better than its two predecessors.

UNSPEAKABLE SCOT. T. W. H. Crosland. *Putnam.*

Some excellent criticism of certain over-praised modern authors and some earnest deprecation of Burns-worship are mingled with utter ranting against everything Scottish. The author exaggerates the natural reaction against the tendency to make an idol of everything Caledonian, and is sometimes almost abusive, but he is also amusing at times.

WAY OF A MAN: Morly Roberts. *Appleton.* $1.00.

Meta Cardew, having ideas as to the proper work for a man, torments her lover, a stock broker, until he enters upon a course of conduct that places him on the rebel side in a Central American revolution. Knowing where he is, but not what he is doing, she follows him, sees his party conquer, and then marries the expelled and defeated President, whose policy is his own, and is not dictated to him by any girl.

WORLD'S PEOPLE; Mrs. Van Rensselaer Cruger (Julien Gordon). *Taylor.* $1 25.

The stories in this volume are either unspeakable in subject or too outspoken in manner. The author leaves nothing even nominally human to her readers' imagination.

WORLD'S SHRINE: Virginia W. Johnson. *Barnes.* $1.20 *net.*

Cleverly written descriptions of Lake Como and its environs interwoven with the traditions attached to the most famous spots.

Books Received.

THEOLOGY.

THE FAITH OF OLD ENGLAND. A Popular Manual of Instructions in the Catholic Faith from a Doctrinal and Historical Standpoint. By the Rev. Vincent Hornyold, S.J. London: Catholic Truth Society. 1902. Pp. xi—191. Price, 45 cents *net.*

LEHRBUCH DER RELIGION. Ein Handbuch zu Deharbes katholischen Katechismus und ein Lesebuch zum Selbstunterrichte. Von W. Wilmers, S.J. Sechste, verbesserte Auflage, nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben von Aug. Lehmkuhl, S.J. Zweiter Band. Von Jesus Christus dem verheissenen Erlöser, vom h. Geiste, von der Kirche, von der Vollendung. (2–12. Glaubensartikel.) Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Buchhandlung. 1902. Pp. xvi–792. Preis, 7 mk. 20 pf.

DE CONSUMMATIONE SANCTORUM Quaestio Unica. Auctore P. Ludovico Ciganotto a Motta ad Liquentiae Flumina, O.F.M., Philosophiae et S. Theologiae lectore generali. (Pro manuscripto.) Venetiis: Sorteni et Vidotti. 1902. Pp. xii—179.

DE FIDE DIVINA LIBRI QUATUOR. Auctore Guilelmo Wilmers, S.J. Opus postumum, post mortem auctoris editum cura Augustini Lehmkuhl, S.J. Cum Approbatione Rmi. Episcopi Ratisb. et Super. Ordinis. Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Friderici Pustet. 1902. Pp. iv—416. Pretium, $2.00 *net.*

STORIA E PREGIO DEI LIBRI CORALI UFFICIALI. Studio del Sac. Franc. Sav. Haberl, Dottore in Theologia. Roma, Ratisbona, Neo-Eboracum: Fr. Pustet. 1902. Pp. iv—69. Pretium, $0.50.

SCRIPTURE.

HERMENEUTICA BIBLICA GENERALIS secundum Principia Catholica. Scripsit Dr. Stephanus Székely, Prof. P. O. Studii Biblici N. T. in Reg. Hung. Scientiarum Universitate Budapestinensi. Cum approb. Rev. Ordinariatus Strigoriensis. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 446. Pretium, $1.95.

DIE EINHEIT DER APOKALYPSE, Gegen die Neuesten Hypothesen der Bibelkritik verteidigt. Von Dr. Matthias Kohlhofer, Pfarrer in Hader-Kleeberg. (Biblische Studien, VII Band, 4 Heft.) Freiburg, St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. viii—143. Preis, $0.80 *net.*

PHILOSOPHY.

DER GOTTESBEWEIS AUS DER BEWEGUNG bei Thomas von Aquin auf seinen Wortlaut untersucht. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik und Erklärung der *Summa contra Gentiles*. Von Simon Weber. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. iv—43. Preis, $0.35 *net.*

DE PULCHRITUDINE DIVINA libri tres. Auctore Henrico Krug, SS. Theologiae Doctore. Cum approb. Rev. Archiepiscopi Friburgensis. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. xvii—252. Pretium, $1.65 *net.*

ÜBER DEN EXISTENZIALBEGRIFF. Von Dr. Adolf Dyroff, ausserordentlichem Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. Br. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. vii—94. Preis, $0.80 *net.*

A COMPLETE EXPOSÉ OF EDDYISM, OR CHRISTIAN SCIENCE, and The Plain Truth in Plain Terms regarding Mary Baker G. Eddy, Founder of Christian Science. By Frederick W. Peabody, Member of the Boston Bar. An Address delivered at Tremont Temple, Boston, on August 1, 1901. Pp. 68. Price, 25 cents.

HISTORY.

WOLFGANG VON SALM, Bischof von Passau (1540–1555). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts. Von Dr. phil. Robert Reichenberger, Priester der Diözese Regensburg. (Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte.) II Band, 1 Heft. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 84. Preis, $0.50 *net.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE DEATH OF SIR LAUNCELOT, and Other Poems. By Condé Benoist Pallen. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co. 1902. Pp. ix—124.